

April 10, 2013

MEMORANDUM

TO: University Senate Members

FROM: Martha Nell Smith
Chair of the University Senate

SUBJECT: University Senate Meeting on Wednesday, April 17, 2013

The next meeting of the University Senate will be held on Wednesday, April 17, 2013. The meeting will run from **3:15 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.**, in the **Atrium of the Stamp Student Union**. **Please note the extended time for the meeting.*

If you are unable to attend or plan to arrive late, please contact the Senate Office¹ by calling 301-405-5805 or sending an email to senate-admin@umd.edu for an excused absence. Your response will assure an accurate quorum count for the meeting.

The meeting materials can be accessed on the Senate Website. Please go to <http://www.senate.umd.edu/meetings/materials/> and click on the date of the meeting.

Meeting Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the April 4, 2013 Senate Minutes (Action)
3. Report of the Chair

Committee Reports

4. 2013 Campus Safety Report (Senate Doc. No. 12-13-48) (Information)
 5. Request to Modify the Membership of the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee to Include a Representative of the Office of the Registrar (Senate Doc. No. 12-13-47) (Action)
 6. Review of the Coursera Program (Senate Doc. No. 12-13-06) (Action)
 7. New Business
 8. Adjournment
-

University Senate

April 4, 2013

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 101

Call to Order

Senate Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 3:24 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

Chair Smith asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the February 14, 2013 meeting. Hearing none she declared the minutes approved as distributed.

Report of the Chair

Corcoran

Smith commented on the proposed new partnership with the Corcoran and the potential opportunities for our university. She explained that President Loh had discussed the potential for this partnership with the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) several weeks ago and again informed the SEC of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) prior to the announcement on Wednesday. She explained that SEC members had been given the opportunity to suggest potential task force members who would be responsible for exploring the new opportunity. Smith assured the Senate that shared governance was involved in this important decision.

Committee Volunteer Period

Smith explained that the volunteer period for Senate standing committees was now open. She encouraged the campus community to volunteer to serve on a committee by going to www.senate.umd.edu. The deadline to volunteer is April 19, 2013.

CUSF Alternate

Smith explained that the Nominations Committee is still looking for nominees for the CUSF alternate representative seat. She encouraged faculty to nominate himself or herself or a colleague by contacting the Senate Staff.

Remaining Senate Meetings

Smith reminded Senators that April 17, 2013 would be the last business meeting of the semester for any outgoing Senators. The May 2, 2013 transition meeting will be for all continuing and incoming senators. Vincent Novara will take over, as Senate Chair, and the Senate will vote for its next chair-elect and elected

committees. The names of candidates running for the various committees and their candidacy statements were distributed to incoming and continuing senators on April 10, 2013.

Implementation of the Policy On Smoking At USM Institutions (Senate Doc. No. 12-13-07) (Action)

Marcia Marinelli, Chair of the Campus Affairs Committee, presented the Implementation of the Policy on Smoking at USM Institutions and provided background information.

Smith opened the floor to discussion of the proposal.

Senator Miletich, Undergraduate, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that he feels that the measures are extreme. We need to look into creating designated smoking areas. We will create a second class of students if we do not have something to accommodate smoking without impinging on others. Many people will not give up smoking so asking them to give up what they have the legal right to do is not appropriate.

Senator Petkas, Exempt Staff, introduced Kristen Vessel, Senator in the Resident's Hall Association (RHA), stated that the RHA has been speaking in town halls with residents. The general consensus is that the ban should be in place to protect non-smokers, not punish smokers. We need, therefore, designated smoking areas. It is a safety issue for students. Locations can be easily accessible but not in heavily trafficked areas and should be covered in case of bad weather. She suggested several possible areas including the wooded area near Hagerstown Hall and Denton Hall, behind the Benjamin Building and Knight Hall, the grassy area near LaPlata Beach. She also suggested a grace period for fall 2013. Most students do not know about the ban or the 25-foot rule. We want to educate students in fall 2013 and then go into full enforcement. She asked the Senate to take the RHA's recommendation into account before making this decision.

Senator Joutz, Non-Exempt Staff, stated that he was curious how enforcement will be handled in this time of budget constraints. It does not make sense to waste people's time with enforcement.

Marinelli responded that the committee does not want the police or police auxiliary to handle enforcement. This is not consistent with our campus culture. Instead, the committee suggests graduated enforcement. We need to focus on a change in culture and in creating new social norms. We are an educational institution so we want to educate people about the health concerns related to smoking. We would like to get to a point where our community feels comfortable telling smokers that we are a smoke-free campus. We need to give people the

skills to have these types of conversations. This is going to be a long-term process.

Senator Lathrop, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, & Natural Sciences, stated that our country's history of prohibition has not gone smoothly, often because of unintended consequences. When we extended the smoking distance, we removed a lot of the smoking receptacles, which has increased the litter from smokers. He showed a collection of cigarette butts collected around his building and commented on the impact on the environment. Another unintended consequence is that discarded cigarette butts are a fire hazard. He proposed an amendment to the committee's recommendation.

The Senate recommends placing at least one fireproof garbage receptacle near each major building, but at least 50 feet away from any building air intake.

The amendment was seconded.

Smith opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Senator Popkin, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, inquired why Senator Lathrop was proposing 50 feet instead of 25 feet, which is the current rule on campus. He was concerned about the confusion that the change could cause.

Lathrop stated that he had no objection to changing it to 25 feet.

Senator Popkin proposed that the amendment be amended from 50 feet to 25 feet. The amendment was seconded.

The Senate recommends placing at least one fireproof garbage receptacle near each major building, but at least 25 feet away from any building air intake.

Smith opened the floor to discussion of the amendment to the amendment; hearing none, she called for a vote on the amendment to the amendment. The result was 73 in favor, 11 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment to the amendment passed.**

Smith opened the floor to discussion of the amendment as amended.

Senator Walters, Faculty, College of Computer Mathematical and Natural Sciences, stated that he supported the amendment and encouraged the campus to post a sign at each receptacle stating that, "the University of Maryland is a smoke-free campus, please dispose of your cigarette here."

Hearing no further discussion, Smith called for a vote on the amendment as amended. The result was 81 in favor, 6 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment passed.**

Senator Davis, Faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering, stated that he supports the University following Board of Regents policy. However, he feels that we should focus our efforts on education not enforcement. He also expressed his displeasure with the litter caused by cigarette butts. We should encourage people to refrain from smoking because doing so is a healthy thing, but we should not waste resources on enforcement.

Senator Popkin, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, stated that he supports the policy and the implementation plan. He also reviewed several statistics about smoking. He also made a motion to approve two amendments.

Communication: Bullet Point 1

The Campus Affairs Committee recommends that the Division of Administration and Finance and University Relations lead the development and dissemination of an appropriate communication and signage strategy for the campus, beginning with awareness communication to start immediately. A smoke-free campus identity campaign should be promulgated throughout campus, and adequate and appropriate signage should be located at all entrances to campus, as well as at major public thoroughfares and spaces, and in campus buildings. **An emphasis should also be placed on the area in front of McKeldin Library.**

The amendment was seconded.

Smith opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Senator Popkin, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, stated that the area in front of McKeldin Library is a high traffic area. This is to insure that this area is well educated about this policy.

Hearing no further discussion, Smith called for a vote of the amendment. The result was 49 in favor, 33 opposed, and 9 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment passed.**

Popkin also made a motion for an additional amendment.

The Campus Affairs Committee recommends that the University conduct periodic evaluations of effectiveness of the policy during the first five years of its implementation. **A specific evaluation of the area in front of McKeldin Library should also be conducted.** The data collected could include measurements of the utilization of health and educational services, and annual surveys of random faculty, staff, and students, among other sources.

The motion was seconded.

Smith opened the floor to discussion of the amendment; hearing none, she called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 30 in favor, 53 opposed, and 10 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment failed.**

Smith opened the floor to discussion of the amended proposal.

Senator Miletich, Undergraduate, College of Arts & Humanities, agreed with Senator Davis's comments about implementation. He stated that if we want to change the culture, we need to take a proactive stance on changing culture. The current policies are not effective so he hopes that future policies are more effective.

Senator Klier, Exempt Staff, stated that this policy is long overdue, and he hopes that it passes. The way to change the culture and to improve our campus is to pass this policy. The cigarette butts around campus are disgusting. All of the reasons against it or for caution ought not be considered. This is the right thing to do.

Senator Popkin, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, stated that the Student Government Association (SGA) passed a resolution supporting the implementation and encouraging President Loh to consider designated areas. He also suggested that the campus community be consulted when decisions are made. The SGA supports the education and outreach component of the proposal.

Hearing no further discussion, Smith called for a vote on the proposal as amended. The result was 71 in favor, 22 opposed, and 1 abstention. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to Establish a Master of Finance (Senate Doc. No. 12-13-46) (Action)

William Idsardi, Chair of the Programs Curricula and Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the PCC Proposal to Establish a Master of Finance and provided background information.

Smith opened the floor to discussion of the proposal.

Senator Ellis, Non-Tenured Research Faculty, inquired whether this program would be a terminal professional degree.

Idsardi confirmed that was the case.

Ellis stated that even though no additional resources were needed, additional funds would be generated from this new program.

Idsardi stated that the business program overall is at a disadvantage in recruitment and placement because of the lack of this program. They receive 1,400 applicants and take fewer than 200. There is, therefore, a demand for the program.

Senator Lubrano, Graduate Student, Robert H. Smith School of Business, echoed the importance of this program. The current configuration does put Smith School students at a disadvantage. Employers are looking for applicants with a Masters in Finance, so this is a necessary change in order to make our students competitive. An asset to the Smith School, the program would also help the alumni.

Hearing no further discussion, Smith called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 89 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Special Order of the Day
Bradley Hatfield
Chair, Joint Provost/Senate APT Guidelines Task Force
Feedback on the Task Force's Charge

Smith introduced Bradley Hatfield, Chair of the Joint Provost/Senate APT Guidelines Task Force, to address the Senate and get feedback.

Hatfield gave a brief overview of the task force's work thus far and noted the breadth of experience of the members on the task force. He stated the importance of the APT process. The task force would like to develop language that is reflective of national trends, is reasonable, clear, and sensitive to a dynamic landscape of issues and recognizes heterogeneity in scholarly paths. The process should not be overly cumbersome or redundant but offer an attempt at leadership in this important process. We have to strike a balance in order to finish our work in a timely manner. He reviewed the elements of the charge, noted that the task force will meet with campus leaders in a variety of areas, and explained that this presentation was an opportunity for the task force to get feedback from the Senate.

Smith opened the floor to feedback and reminded the Senate not to discuss any specific APT cases.

Senator Mallios, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, echoed a sense of high importance of this work but raised concerns about the confusing elements about the external evaluators that are currently in the guidelines. He noted that #10 in

the guidelines manual excludes the candidate's mentors and collaborators, item #12 says that a solicitation letter should ask if the reviewer is a co-author or collaborator, item #13 states that an evaluator who is the candidate's dissertation advisor, former teacher, co-author or student should be avoided. This language is ambiguous and confusing. The language feels like policy language and it is difficult to know what to do, particularly with the issue of collaboration and former teachers. This is a subject of grave concern. This is a complicated matter on which people from different disciplines across and outside of our campus should weigh in.

Hatfield reiterated that the purpose today is to get an awareness of what is in the minds of people here. Our goal is to have language that is reasonable and clear and reflective of national trends. There is a standard of reasonableness to which we subscribe that works for cases that are not controversial. Our purpose is to remove ambiguity and be reasonable. As far as the notion of conflict of interest is concerned, we need something that is reasonable but gives good guidance.

Senator Mallios stated that conflict of interest as the principle that underlies selecting outside reviewers is sound but wonders when it comes to matters of policy—principle alone is insufficient for guiding APT committees. More specific guidance is needed.

Hatfield noted that we want to preserve the goal that the people doing the evaluation should be knowledgeable about that scholar.

Senator Kalnay, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, stated that in her experience with writing letters of reference, she frequently gets an email asking whether she would be willing to write a letter. These other universities filter out people who do not want to write letters using this manner, but our University does not consistently follow this procedure. There must be a good reason either to do it or not, but some very good universities do follow this procedure so it is worth looking into. Hatfield stated that this procedure is in our sphere of consideration of different issues.

Senator Segal, Faculty, College of Behavioral & Social Science, stated that two trends to which we have to be sensitive are that the number of references we require is increasing and aligns with the national trend. Also, we place a high premium on the letterhead more than the appropriateness of the writer. This means that requests for letters get highly concentrated. The fact that our faculty are asked more frequently to write letters is a sign of our increasing prestige. The question for UM is, what is reasonable. When we are asked has also become a factor. The other trend is that those who get asked to write letters have elderly parents or have other family obligations. This trend will increase but we need to be careful about how we interpret the reasons potential evaluators

decline when it is unrelated to the quality of the candidate but rather the demography of their family.

Senator Levy, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, stated that the APT process should be one of the most stable processes on our campus. It is a good idea to review the process periodically, but changes should be minor since the way we mentor our junior faculty is based on the principles in the APT guidelines. If we make major changes in our procedures frequently, though could inadvertently adversely affect our junior faculty. We need to consider how we phase in any changes. Do the principles apply for people hired by a certain date or do they apply retroactively to everyone? He asked the task force to consider that aspect of the process. Hatfield stated that Levy had made an excellent point that should be considered.

Senator Beckett, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, asked that the task force consider consistency within departments and across departments. She also suggested that the task force consider the correlation between the letterhead and knowledge of writer. In other words, does prestigious letterhead guarantee knowledge of the field and the work being reviewed. If you just look at the letterhead, you will get a short letter that does not address the qualifications of the candidates. Departments feel a lot of pressure for the best letterhead but that is not wise because you need substantive feedback by people who are knowledgeable about the candidate and the work being reviewed.

Hatfield stated that the expertise of the reviewer is of critical concern.

Senator Mallios introduced Kumea Shorter-Gooden, Chief Diversity Officer and Associate Vice President. She stated that she is grateful to see an element about diversity in the task force's charge. She would like the task force to consider this broadly. We have huge disparities in the promotion and tenure rates of faculty by ethnicity. The issue of how diversity and diversity issues are engaged in the APT process is critical. She stated to consider whether faculty research on diversity issues in underserved populations can be evaluated fairly. We should also consider how to diminish the impact of any negative biases about faculty members from underrepresented groups, including colleagues' biases and students' biases expressed in course evaluations. There should be consideration of whether contributions from faculty from underrepresented groups to the diversity of the University should be considered. In other words, the task force should consider whether being diverse and contributing a diverse perspective in background, identity group, or heritage are factors that should be counted in some way, given our commitment to inclusive excellence. She encouraged the task force to think broadly to help address the persistent disparities in tenure and promotion rates by ethnicity.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Policies & Procedures (Senate Doc. No. 12-13-41) (Action)

Thomas Holtz, Co-Chair of the Joint Provost/Senate Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Task Force, presented the Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Policies and Procedures report and provided background information.

Smith opened the floor to discussion of the task force's report.

Senator Davis, Faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering, thanked the task force for its work. He stated that this is a complex issue. We benefit greatly from the Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty. He also pointed out that salary committees review the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) but some if not all NTT faculty cannot access that system so that they cannot be considered for merit. Holtz responded that some NTT faculty have to complete the FAR but it could be inconsistent.

Marc Pound, Member of the Task Force, stated that the survey that the task force conducted showed that 50% of NTT faculty did not know what a FAR is. Some have to complete it, but some do not.

Senator Ellis, Non-Tenured Research Faculty, stated that in his unit, research faculty can complete the FAR but it does not go to merit because there is no existing policy on merit for NTT faculty. He also noted that NTT faculty could not be Primary Investigators (PIs) on grants, so tenured/tenure-track faculty must be listed and therefore get the official credit for the work. Obviously, there are many administrative and policy issues that need to be addressed. He reminded the Senate that by accepting the report and asking the SEC to examine these recommendations, the body is not agreeing with all of the recommendations but rather making a statement that these are issues that require further consideration. He encouraged the Senate to vote in favor of the proposal.

Senator Lathrop, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences (CMNS), stated that 1100 of 2800 research faculty are in CMNS. They play a vital role in research and teaching. He clarified that all faculty with faculty titles are required at least to certify their conflict of interest in the FAR. Whether they choose to enter information is up to them, but the FAR must be completed because it is needed for qualifying for merit. Each college or department determines who can or cannot be a PI. It is not a campus-wide policy. Many colleges have PI policies. In CMNS, research faculty can be PIs. He stated that he does agree uniformly with the broader issues and recommendations in the report.

Senator Macri, Full-Time Instructors, thanked the task force for its work. She explained that the survey itself was a huge gesture to NTT faculty. She noted that NTT faculty teach more than half of credits for honors and scholars students.

She also noted that there are 3 NTT faculty who were awarded CTE Lily fellowships. Some administrators are also NTT faculty. This shows the dedication and distinction that NTT faculty bring to our campus. We want to continue the dialogue that is in the report.

Senator Burns, Undergraduate, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, expressed that he is afraid that student evaluations will not be taken seriously because the report states, "Ensure that evaluations of Instructional Faculty are not tied solely to the CourseEvalUM tool".

Senator Macri, Full-Time Instructors, introduced Scott Wible, Director of Professional Writing Program (PWP) & Associate Professor of English, who stated that professional writing is one of three required fundamental studies requirements in the general education program. He stated that he was speaking on behalf of the 60 NTT instructors in PWP. PWP instructors are a diverse group that comes with extensive and various work-place expertise. Collectively, NTT teaching faculty in the PWP program teach over 5,000 students each year. Writing instruction demands a lot of time and energy. While our instructors' contractual obligations are instructional by nature, the relatively small class size in PWP courses means that many of its instructors also provide informal service for the University and its undergraduates. A variety of students turn to these instructors when they have problems because these instructors know them well. PWP instructors give their time generously to help these students. The NTT faculty in turn needs the Senate's time and energy in determining how best to engage, how best to support financially, and how best to support intellectually this large group of our faculty as they help us enhance the University's collective research, teaching, and service missions. He thanked the task force and encouraged the Senate to vote in favor of the proposal.

Senator Popkin, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, commended the task force on its work and stated that we should especially consider the representation of NTT faculty on the Senate.

Senator Reynolds, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, thanked the task force for its work. He stated that Astronomy lives and dies by its NTT faculty in the instructional and research realms. He explained that the current merit review process is for a merit increase in April 2014. For NTT faculty who are only here for 1-2 years, this timeline means that they are not fairly assessed for merit during that period. He inquired whether the task force considered this.

Senator Baron, Part-Time Instructors, thanked the Senate and the Provost for commissioning the task force and the task force for its amazing work. She stated that she has been a NTT faculty member her entire career. She noted that she used to have to complete the FAR but longer is required. NTT faculty in her unit are not part of the merit review process, and she has not received a raise in her

entire career at the University. She has worked on issues relating to the status and condition of NTT faculty for several years. There is a lot of useful information coming out of this report including how much research funding NTT faculty bring in. This is a great step in leadership for our University. This is not a conversation on our campus but is a nationwide discussion for which UM is emerging as a leader.

Senator Mallios introduced Kumea Shorter-Gooden, Chief Diversity Officer and Associate Vice President. She stated that this is in part an issue of diversity and inclusion. She applauded the task force for its recommendations and encouraged the Senate to take this up. She noted that we are wrestling with and can be leaders in how to include fully people who are engaged in different ways, who have different gifts/skills/capacities/areas of work, and so not have people who are marginalized or second-class citizens. We are addressing that in part with staff, which is part of the same bailiwick.

Hearing no further discussion, Smith called for a vote to accept the report. The result was 74 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention. **The motion to accept the report passed.**

Novara made a motion to direct the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) to charge the appropriate Senate committees with the specific policy recommendations.

Smith opened the floor to discussion of the motion; hearing none, she called for a vote on the motion. The result was 64 in favor, 1 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The motion passed.**

Proposal to Change the Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) Operating Procedure (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-13) (Action)

Joshua Hiscock, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, presented the Proposal to Change the Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) Operating Procedure and provided background information.

Smith opened the floor to discussion of the proposal.

Senator Popkin, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, stated that the new recommendations get to the concerns raised in the minority report and expand the review process so that it is more comprehensive. He encouraged the Senate to vote in favor of the proposal.

Hearing no further discussion, Smith called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 55 in favor, 0 opposed, and 9 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Calculation of Commencement Honors (Senate Doc. No. 12-13-03) (Action)

Christopher Davis, Chair of the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee, presented the Calculation of Commencement Honors report and provided background information.

Smith opened the floor to discussion of the proposal; hearing none, she called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 58 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Revisions to the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (BSOS) Plan of Organization (Senate Doc. No. 12-13-08) (Action)

Devin Ellis, Chair of the Elections, Representation & Governance (ERG) Committee, presented the Revisions to the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (BSOS) Plan of Organization and provided background information.

Smith opened the floor to discussion of the proposal; hearing none, she called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 50 in favor, 0 opposed, and 7 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Revisions to the Philip Merrill College of Journalism Plan of Organization (Senate Doc. No. 12-13-09) (Action)

Devin Ellis, Chair of the Elections, Representation & Governance (ERG) Committee presented the Revisions to the Philip Merrill College of Journalism Plan of Organization and provided background information.

Smith opened the floor to discussion of the proposal; hearing none, she called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 50 in favor, 1 opposed, and 4 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

New Business

There was no new business.

Adjournment

Senate Chair Smith adjourned the meeting at 5:18 p.m.



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	12-13-48
Title:	Campus Safety Report 2013
Presenter:	Marcy Marinelli, Chair, Campus Affairs Committee
Date of SEC Review:	April 8, 2013
Date of Senate Review:	April 17, 2013
Voting (highlight one):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report 4. For information only
Statement of Issue:	<p>The Senate Bylaws (Article 6 Section 2) designate the Campus Affairs Committee as a liaison between the campus community and the University Police on matters of safety and security. The committee is formally charged with gathering input from the community on safety and security issues. The committee holds an annual campus safety forum to fulfill this charge. The 2012-2013 Safety Forum took place on Tuesday, March 12th from 4:00pm – 6:00pm in the Stamp Student Union, with a focus on personal safety on and off campus.</p>
Relevant Policy # & URL:	Not Applicable.
Recommendation:	The Campus Affairs Committee presents the 2013 Campus Safety Report to the Senate as an informational item.
Committee Work:	<p>In February 2013, the Campus Affairs Committee decided that the annual safety forum would focus on personal safety on and off campus, with an emphasis from panelists on tips for staying safe and resources available on campus. The panel for the event included Chief David Mitchell from the University Department of Public Safety / University Police, Major Rob Brewer from the Prince George's County Police, Samantha Zwerling from the Student Government Association (SGA), David Colon Cabrera from the Graduate Student Government (GSG), and John Zacker from the Behavioral Evaluation and Threat Assessment (BETA) Team. The event was co-sponsored by the SGA and the GSG.</p>
Alternatives:	Not Applicable.
Risks:	Not Applicable.
Financial Implications:	Not Applicable.
Further Approvals Required:	Not Applicable.

Senate Campus Affairs Committee

Senate Document # 12-13-48

Senate Campus Affairs Committee Annual Safety Report

April 2013

BACKGROUND

In describing the standing committees of the University Senate, the Senate Bylaws (Article 6 Section 2) designate the Campus Affairs Committee as a liaison between the campus community and the University Police on matters of safety and security. The committee is formally charged with gathering input from the community on safety and security issues. To fulfill this charge, the committee holds an annual campus safety forum. The purpose of the forum is to provide a venue for community members to voice their concerns and interact with representatives from the University Department of Public Safety and other offices.

The 2012-2013 Annual Safety Forum took place on Tuesday, March 12th, 2013 from 4:00pm – 6:00pm in the Stamp Student Union, with a focus on personal safety on and off campus.

COMMITTEE WORK

The Campus Affairs Committee decided upon a theme for the safety forum at its meeting on February 15th, 2013. The committee considered its previous ideas and reflected on the greatest concerns facing the University, especially in light of an incident a few days earlier in which two UMD students died and one student was injured. The committee discussed the importance of personal safety and how little community members know about critical services available to them. Committee members stressed the need to cultivate a culture of care at the University, where community members watch out for each other and where those who need help know who to ask or where to go. Such an environment would challenge misconceptions about safety and could break the stigma of seeking help. Ultimately, the committee decided upon a broader theme for the safety forum focusing on personal safety on and off campus, with an emphasis from panelists on tips for staying safe and resources available on campus.

The committee invited representatives from the University Department of Public Safety / University Police, the Student Government Association (SGA), the Graduate Student Government (GSG), the Behavioral Evaluation and Threat Assessment (BETA) Team, and the Prince George's County Police to serve on the panel at the safety forum. In the hopes of broadening the reach of the event, the committee also asked the SGA and GSG to co-sponsor the event. Both groups agreed and assisted in logistical and financial planning for the event.

PROTECT THE SHELL: THE SENATE CAMPUS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ANNUAL SAFETY FORUM

Campus Affairs Committee Chair Marcy Marinelli opened the safety forum. She explained that the committee is charged with gathering information on safety and security and that it sponsors the forum with the goal of sharing information about campus services and creating a space to hear concerns from the campus community about safety and security. She thanked the SGA and GSG for their co-sponsorship of the event, and introduced each of the panelists in turn.

Panel Discussion

❖ Chief David Mitchell, Director, University Department of Public Safety

Chief Mitchell opened his remarks by acknowledging what a difficult time it has been for the University in the wake of the shooting incident in February. He expressed that the University must recognize the terrible loss it endured. He noted that the campus is still healing and voiced his hope that such conflict would not be seen at UMD again.

Chief Mitchell noted that since February, the University Police has seen an increase in calls reporting suspicious activity. He welcomed the increase, and stressed that the University Police can only respond to incidents they know about, so they encourage community members to call when they feel it might be appropriate. He discussed crime in general, and noted that crime has gone down over the last five years, and it is continuing to decrease. He shared that the largest concern on campus remains the theft of electronic devices, especially Apple products and cell phones.

In his remarks, Chief Mitchell stressed the importance of saying something in situations where something is, or might be, wrong. He spoke about the Community on Patrol program and asked for the continued partnership of those present in working to keep the campus safe through this program. He urged that if someone begins acting in a manner that causes concern, individuals should not hesitate to tell someone, whether that be the University Police, the BETA Team, or someone else. He stressed that the primary interest of the police for individuals in distress is that they get the assistance they need. He impressed upon those present that each community member has a vested interest in making the campus a safe and secure environment.

❖ Major Rob Brewer, Commander, District 1 Station, Prince Georges County Police

Major Rob Brewer serves as Commander of District 1 in Prince George's County, an area that includes College Park. He explained that the PG County Police do not have jurisdiction on campus, but do have primary jurisdiction over the areas surrounding campus. He noted that the PG County Police work closely with the University Police, and PG County values its relationship with UMD.

Major Brewer discussed safety and crime in the county, including in College Park. He noted that the PG Police are seeing an increase in theft, particularly from automobiles. The department is conducting an awareness campaign to encourage individuals to keep valuables out of cars and move items out of view. He stated that of particular concern are large parking lots that seem to be targeted for thefts.

Major Brewer assured the audience that College Park is a very safe community. As it is on-campus, crime has been decreasing in the areas surrounding campus and recently reached its lowest point since the mid-1980s. He noted, however, that there are always incidents that cause alarm, and with social media, there is a greater awareness when events occur. He indicated that such awareness in the community is important and positive.

❖ John Zacker, Chair, the BETA Team

John Zacker began his remarks by explaining the history of groups like the BETA Team around the country. Many universities around the country have created teams with the purpose of evaluating situations and assessing potential threats. Groups that evaluate behavior on college campuses began to develop in response to notable incidents on campuses, such as the Virginia Tech shooting in 2007. The Team at UMD has been in existence for eight years.

The BETA Team is comprised of its chair, who is also the Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs; the Director of the Mental Health Service, who is a licensed psychiatrist; the Director of the Counseling Center, who is a licensed psychologist; the Director of the Office of Student Conduct; and a trained threat assessor from the University Police. The team meets weekly to evaluate situations that have arisen and occasionally invites faculty, staff, or students to consult with the Team on specific situations. The Team assesses what intervention might be appropriate and takes action when necessary.

Dr. Zacker stressed that the BETA Team is meant to be on call in situations involving non-specific, concerning behavior in an individual known to the person reporting. Most of the cases seen by the BETA Team come from faculty and staff concerned about how someone is behaving in the classroom or at work, particularly if the behavior has changed in a concerning manner. He stressed that the BETA Team is not a substitute for the police in the case of an immediate threat of physical harm.

Dr. Zacker echoed Chief Mitchell's message of calling someone and telling any individual of authority when something does not seem right. He conceded that, especially for students, calling the police seems like an extreme step. He stressed that the University community should reinforce the notion that individuals should never be afraid to call the police. In lieu of the police, Dr. Zacker advised calling anyone of authority to allow the situation to be evaluated.

❖ Samantha Zwerling, President, Student Government Association

Samantha Zwerling discussed many of the initiatives the Student Government Association has been working on related to safety. She discussed the safety walks in the fall and spring semester, which involve participation of the University Police, the PG County Police, and stakeholders like Pepco and Facilities Management. The group walks around campus and identifies areas where students do not feel safe and discuss solutions like fixing lights or adding crosswalks to busy intersections. The walks serve as an opportunity for students to give feedback on safety and for those who are responsible for things like lights and grounds to take steps to address problems.

The SGA has also been working on improving Nite Ride. Nite Ride provides free rides to community members to areas not included on the evening service bus and shuttle routes. The SGA has been working with DOTs to improve the services, while understanding that there is only so much money in the budget to do so. As an example of a tangible outcome of this work, Ms. Zwerling discussed the new area for motor pool in east campus. Many students felt unsafe walking to this area at night, and the SGA worked with DOTs to extend the range of Nite Ride to take students there at night.

Ms. Zwerling noted that the SGA works very closely with the University and PG County Police, and that she spends works with the City of College Park as well to address quality of life and safety issues both on and off campus. She noted the SGA's concern that the City of College Park view students as residents of College Park, not just as students, and that student safety is a priority.

Ms. Zwerling noted a few issues in the University Senate that the SGA supports. In 2011, the Senate passed the Responsible Action Policy, which protects a student under the influence of alcohol who calls for medical assistance from disciplinary sanctions for the possession or use of alcohol, even if the student happens to be underage. The policy promotes taking action in situations where medical help is needed. Ms. Zwerling noted that the Senate recently approved an expansion of the policy to include drugs, and stated her view that this shows the University's commitment to keeping students safe. Ms. Zwerling also noted that a proposal has been submitted to the University Senate related to sexual assault training for students, and noted that she felt such training would have an important impact on understanding and reporting of sexual assault on campus.

In discussing the crime alerts, Ms. Zwerling noted that the SGA has heard a lot of reports about the frequency of alerts. She noted that crime has gone down, but the alerts raise the question of actual safety versus perceived safety. She suggested that the frequency of alerts sometimes makes students feel less safe. The SGA is concerned about this perception, although it also recognizes that students need to be informed of incidents occurring on and off campus.

❖ David Colon Cabrera, President, the Graduate Student Government

David Colon Cabrera noted that the GSG is constantly working on safety issues, particularly because graduate students are a different population than the rest of the campus community. Most graduate students do not live on campus, so many of the concerns heard by the GSG are from commuter students.

Mr. Colon Cabrera discussed the GSG's safety walks, and noted that there has been a focus on the areas surrounding campus near where many graduate students live, since many safety concerns have to do with traveling to and from campus. These walks have resulted in improvements in lighting and sidewalks. For instance, the area by Graduate Gardens housing and Adelphi Road can be a dangerous area. As a result of the safety walks, there is now a crosswalk across Adelphi for students to use.

Recently, the GSG has been discussing how mental health and safety are related and how the GSG can contribute to the conversation about mental health at the University. He noted again that graduate students are different here as well; graduate students are often older than undergraduates, and in many cases are married or living with roommates in different areas. The GSG wants to start conversations about domestic issues and how to address roommate and partner safety situations. He cited the experience of a student in calling the police to report a domestic disturbance next door to explain how difficult it can be to make a call in these cases. The GSG wants to stress that safety is everyone's responsibility and is a part of being considerate of others.

Open Forum

❖ The BETA Team and University Police

During the open forum, a few people asked questions about the BETA Team and the University Police. One person noted that while most of the reports to the BETA Team are from faculty, students are those who would be most likely to notice signs since they would be spending the most time with peers. He asked if there were ways to educate the University community on how to recognize issues. Chair Marinelli noted that the Counseling Center does presentations called "Helping Students in Distress," which outlines signs to look for and what to do, but the presentations are not offered to students because there has never been interest. The person noted that in this situation, these are things students should know about, but it may not be something students would actively look for. Chief Mitchell noted that this information was important to know, and suggested that the Police could create a video about signs of distress and behaviors that cause concern, to be made available online.

An audience member noted that while some students feel hesitant to call 911 or unsure of whether an issue warrants calling 911, many would probably feel comfortable calling the BETA Team. However, the BETA phone number is available only during business hours. He suggested that with an around-the-clock hotline to refer students to the appropriate place at all hours, students may feel more comfortable calling and may better remember who to call if there was one number. He also noted that many students do not know about the BETA Team, so aggressive marketing of the Team and who to call in what circumstances would be great.

Another audience member asked about the Community on Patrol program and whether it has seen evidence of more calls or whether it is working, and to what extent those calls are transferred over to the BETA Team. Chief Mitchell explained that the Community on Patrol program is focused more on suspicious behavior of individuals you may not know, regardless of whether they are students. Chief Mitchell noted that the Police wants to receive these calls and is encouraged by the increase. The BETA Team is focused more on behavior of individuals you do know, in the context of being a student or a roommate or through some other type of relationship. Calls for the BETA Team could come in to the Police and they would be forwarded on to the Team. He recognized the concern about having too many numbers and not knowing who to call when, and suggested that he would work with Dr. Zacker on a 24 hour call reception strategy.

Dr. Zacker noted that it is important to understand that these groups all work in consultation with each other, and if one group is aware of something, the others will be informed. In situations of imminent harm or danger, including situations involving weapons, calls should immediately be made to the Police. In less well-defined situations with unusual behavior, calls should be made to the BETA Team.

❖ Mental Health Services

An audience member asked about the University's plans regarding mental health services on campus, particularly with the Help Center. The individual noted that students see the Help Center as the first place to go. Chief Mitchell stated that President Loh is in the process of increasing the number of mental health professionals on campus. Dr. Zacker noted that this is a challenging dilemma being faced by institutions nationally. Discerning what is an appropriate level of service, and how long one should wait for service, are challenging issues that are being evaluated at UMD. In addition, the Counseling Center is currently searching for more staff psychologists, and has been discussing ways that divisions could work together more effectively in cases where students do not have a critical need but are waiting for service.

In discussing mental health services, Ms. Zwerling noted that the SGA is looking at the issue of levels of service and has been discussing the issues with the Help Center. She noted her view that the University is putting its students at risk by the current staffing levels, and the University is at risk by having a student body that is suffering in mind and in grades. She noted that the SGA wants to focus on early interventions in the hopes of ameliorating conditions before anything rises to the level of an emergency situation.

Mr. Colon Cabrera stated that the GSG is very involved in these discussions as well. He noted the large attrition rate of Ph.D. students, and cited the lack of support and issues related to mental health as reasons for attrition. He pointed out that the University is partially limited because these services are to a certain extent funded through student fees. There is only so much that can be done with fees and he suggested changing to a system that is not so reliant on fees for funding for mental health services.

❖ Police Jurisdiction

A few individuals present asked about the jurisdiction of the UMD and PG County Police. Major Brewer provided an overview of their jurisdictions. The PG County Police have primary jurisdiction in parts of College Park outside of campus, which means they are the primary law enforcement provider. UMD Police has concurrent jurisdiction in that area, which means they can take police action, but when an issue comes up and they respond, PG County Police has to decide whether to take over the issue or allow UMD Police to handle it. Major Brewer noted that the two units have a good relationship and if UMD Police come across a situation, PG Police usually let them handle it to the extent possible. On campus, UMD police have primary jurisdiction, but if PG County Police saw something, they could take action because the jurisdiction is not exclusive. There are talks now of expanding the UMD Police jurisdiction, but Major Brewer did not expand on details of that process. Major Brewer also noted that there is quite a bit of

police presence in College Park – the UMD and PG County Police are present, but also Metro Transit Police, Maryland Park Police, and State of Maryland Police.

❖ Transportation Safety

Chief Mitchell noted that one concern the University Police face has to do with the UMD shuttle buses. The Police know that there are people who ride the shuttles who are not students – most of these individuals pose no problem, but some can pose a threat to the community. The Police are working with DOTs to address the issue by checking IDs to ride the shuttle buses. Members of the panel noted that appropriate IDs would include IDs from cities that UMD has agreements with – so, for example, individuals who live in Hyattsville will still be able to ride the shuttle buses per an agreement with the University. Programs are being worked out to provide IDs to residents so they can board buses.

An audience member asked about checking IDs when driving on campus at night. Chief Mitchell noted that license plates are read by cameras on campus, but also pointed out that while UMD is a very open campus, it is staffed at night so that the Police are there to check IDs and vehicles. The purpose of this is so that students can be assured that checks are happening, and so that people who want to come to campus with ill intentions know that they have been monitored.

❖ Safety Tips

An audience member asked the Police what the biggest issues students can help address, and what students can do to be safer on campus. Chief Mitchell gave four main tips. First, he noted that situational awareness is key. He advised that everyone on campus be aware of their surroundings. Second, he advised taking care of personal property to guard against theft. Third, he encouraged people to call the police when police might be able to help. In cases where they are not going to be of help, they still do not mind being called. He noted that any opportunities they have to intervene through 911 or through the BETA Team are positive opportunities. Fourth, he advised not engaging in high-risk behavior. He noted that in cases with alcohol, individuals should be careful not to consume alcohol in a manner that renders them unconscious or unsafe. He stressed that as a University, the community should look after each other, and that is part of what the Police seek to do.

❖ Additional Comments and Suggestions.

A campus community member shared her perspective that the lack of personal awareness on campus was a large problem, and suggested paying more attention to surroundings and being more careful when walking alone at night. She noted that other campuses have a Rape Aggression Defense Program and asked why UMD does not have one. A police officer present and familiar with the program noted that UMD did have one at one point, but it was not well received. Students who signed up for the program did not attend, and it was a large time commitment for officers and for students. Chief Mitchell noted that he would be willing to reinstate such a program if there was an interest, and suggested that the SGA and GSG try to gauge whether men and women on campus would be interested in making self-defense classes more accessible.

An audience member suggested that there are universities that have driving services offered by athletic groups. She noted that at her previous institution, during periods of high partying, athletics would provide cars and athletes to be on call to drive students home from parties for free or in exchange for a donation that went to the team. She suggested looking into expanding similar options to get students involved in programs to avoid drunk driving. Panel members noted that there are businesses that operate with similar models. An audience member shared that the University used to have a service called Terrapin Taxi, which had a \$5 charge for a ride within a mile of the University. The service was disbanded because there

was not enough interest. Ms. Zwerling stated that the fact that there was no interest shocked her, and suggested that perhaps the University could discuss whether to reinstate such a program.

A question was raised about the police auxiliary and what the Police can do to raise awareness of the program that provides free escorts on campus. Chief Mitchell stated that the Police are very proud of the student police aides, and noted that they do a great job at escorting people at night and helping with other things like directing traffic on game days. He noted that he always advises students to walk in groups at night, but in cases where it is late at night and someone feels unsafe, he always encourages them to call the Police to ask for an escort. The service does not charge. He noted that the Police are working with the Division of Information Technology to help advertise and manage the escort program. He also suggested that this might be a topic that he could send out as part of the Police blog to remind students about what safety services exist on campus.

One person asked what options student groups have in planning safety events and who they can contact with safety concerns or questions. Chief Mitchell encouraged her to contact the police or any other group, either online or after the forum. He noted that the Police love to do demonstrations and speakers bureaus, and stated that they are important because the Police learn from them too. The Police will provide information and events on any subject discussed at the forum, from date rape and sexual violence to consumption of alcohol.

CONCLUSION

In closing, Chair Marinelli thanked the panelists for their time. She noted that the key takeaway message for her was that the University community needs to focus on taking care of each other.

The Campus Affairs Committee met on March 28th, 2013 and discussed the forum. It reviewed some of the information shared at the forum related to the BETA Team, the successful relationship University Police has with the PG County Police, and resources on campus. In the execution of the forum, committee members discussed attendance at the forum and many members noted that they hoped for higher attendance, especially from students. The committee discussed the difficulty in trying to get people excited and interested in safety. Members noted that the forum might be too broad, and perhaps a more topical and specific approach could draw more attention. Past forums have been very specific, like one directed at motor scooter safety and another at sexual harassment.

The committee discussed the logistics of the event, and things to do differently in future forums. The committee suggests considering the appropriateness of the timing of the event. The timing is difficult to arrange, and a committee member noted that some campus constituents could be disadvantaged by it. For instance, students and student athletes may be disadvantaged by a 4pm-6pm time slot. The committee also suggests considering new marketing strategies for the event. The marketing of the event was largely based on social media, which was positive, but committee members suggested finding new ways to alert the campus community to be more visible to potential attendees. The committee also discussed the overall structure of the event and suggested rethinking it to see if there might be a better way to get the feedback the committee wants. Members discussed asking the SGA and GSG to be more active in the planning and structure of the event, or tying the forum to another standing event related to safety.



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	12-13-47
Title:	Modify the Membership of the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee to Include a Representative of the Office of the Registrar
Presenter:	Devin Ellis Chair, Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee
Date of SEC Review:	April 8, 2013
Date of Senate Review:	April 17, 2013
Voting (highlight one):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	<p>The Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee formulates and reviews policies, and procedures governing admission, academic standing, and student dismissal. The committee examines issues related to academic advisement, scheduling of classes, and course registration. Additionally, APAS creates and analyzes policies to be observed by instructional staff in conducting classes, seminars, examinations, students' research, and student evaluations. The APAS Committee has relied on information and advice from the Office of the Registrar on an ad-hoc basis in considering its charges. In order to facilitate closer and more consistent communication on these issues, a proposal was submitted in March 2013 to consider changing the membership of the APAS Committee to include a representative from the Office of the Registrar.</p> <p>The APAS Committee currently has twenty seats. The committee membership includes a chair, ten faculty members, three undergraduate and two graduate students, and the following persons or a representative of each: the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Director of Undergraduate Admissions, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School. All ex-officio members may vote. Quorum for the committee stands at nine members.</p>

Relevant Policy # & URL:	Not Applicable.
Recommendation:	The Elections, Representation, & Governance Committee recommends that the Bylaws of the University Senate be amended to include a voting, ex-officio member on the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee who shall be the University Registrar, or his or her designee. The Committee further recommends that the Bylaws be amended to change the quorum of the APAS Committee to be ten voting members.
Committee Work:	<p>The ERG Committee reviewed the proposal and background information about the APAS Committee on March 26, 2013. The committee reviewed the current committee composition, APAS Committee charges that related to the Office of the Registrar, and other details. The committee found that the frequency with which the APAS Committee needs to consult with the Office of the Registrar and the fact that the University Registrar specifically requested membership on the committee serve as compelling reasons to change the membership of the committee.</p> <p>Further deliberation of the charge focused on whether a representative should be voting or non-voting and the number of ex-officio members on the committee. The committee raised concerns regarding the number of voting ex-officio members on Senate committees and stressed again that committees should not be able to reach quorum or pass measures with only ex-officio members.</p> <p>After discussion, the ERG Committee voted to recommend amending Article 6 section 1 of the Bylaws of the University Senate to include a voting, ex-officio representative from the Office of the Registrar in the APAS Committee’s membership, and to increase the quorum of the committee to ten voting members.</p> <p>6.1.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; ten (10) faculty members; three (3) undergraduate and two (2) graduate students; and the following persons or a representative of each: the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Director of Undergraduate Admissions, the University Registrar, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies, and the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School.</p> <p>6.1.b Quorum: A quorum of the Academic Procedures and Standards Committee shall be nine (9) ten (10) voting members.</p>

Alternatives:	The Senate could reject the recommendation and the current membership of the APAS Committee would continue unaltered. However, without such a change to committee membership, the APAS Committee may face difficulties in responding to charges that are directly related to the Office of the Registrar.
Risks:	There are no associated risks.
Financial Implications:	There are no financial implications.
Further Approvals Required:	Senate approval, Presidential approval.

Senate Elections, Representation, & Governance Committee

Senate Document 12-13-47

Modify the Membership of the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee to Include a Representative of the Office of the Registrar

April 2013

BACKGROUND

The membership of each standing committee of the Senate is described in Article 6 of the Bylaws of the University Senate. Outside of its designated membership, a committee may invite representatives from various departments across campus to participate in meetings, as appropriate, though those invitations do not guarantee the representative any right to be heard or to vote on the business before the committee. The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) is empowered under Article 5 to appoint non-voting ex-officio members to committees at its discretion, but a formal permanent change in committee membership, including the addition of regular, voting ex-officio members, requires an amendment to the Senate Bylaws.

Occasionally, committees find that the specifications in the Bylaws are insufficient for effective and efficient consideration of committee business, whether as a result of the types of charges they are considering, or because of technical difficulties they have in conducting business. In past cases, the Bylaws have been amended to better serve the needs of the committees. For example, in 2011 the Senate voted to approve new quorum calculations in response to a chronic problem committees had in reaching quorum to conduct business (Appendix 2).

The Bylaws charge the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee with reviewing policies and procedures related to admission, readmission, academic standing, and student dismissal; academic advising, course scheduling, and course registration; and the conduct of classes, seminars, exams, student research, and student evaluations. The APAS Committee has relied on information and advice from the Office of the Registrar on an ad-hoc basis in considering its charges over the last few years. In order to facilitate closer and more consistent communication on these issues, a proposal (Appendix 3) was submitted to the Senate in March 2013 to consider changing the membership of the APAS Committee to include a representative from the Office of the Registrar.

CURRENT PRACTICE

The APAS Committee currently has twenty seats. The Bylaws specify that the committee shall be made up of a chair, ten faculty members, three undergraduate and two graduate students, and the following persons or a representative of each: the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Director of Undergraduate Admissions, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School. All ex-officio members are voting members. Quorum for the committee stands at nine voting members.

The APAS Committee has recently considered a number of charges that have required the expertise of the Office of the Registrar, and the committee is often specifically asked by the SEC in charges to consult with the Registrar. As an example, the recent charge for the "Proposal to Implement a Retroactive

Withdrawal Policy at the University of Maryland” asked the committee to consult with the Office of the Registrar on current procedures and to get input on the effects of proposed changes.

COMMITTEE WORK

On March 14, 2013, the Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee was charged with reviewing the proposal and evaluating whether the membership of the APAS Committee should be altered (Appendix 3). The committee reviewed background information connected with the charge and discussed the proposal at its meeting on March 26, 2013.

The committee found that the APAS Committee has considered many issues that impact the Registrar’s office in the last few years. The committee noted that the frequency with which the APAS Committee needs to consult with the Office of the Registrar, and the fact that the University Registrar specifically requested membership on the committee, serve as compelling reasons to change the membership of the committee.

In discussing the technical details of adding such a representative, the ERG Committee considered two remaining questions: 1) whether a representative should be voting or non-voting; and 2) whether the number of ex-officio members on the committee was too great a percentage of total membership, and how it would impact quorum.

In determining whether a representative should be able to vote, the committee noted that most ex-officio members on Senate committees are voting members, and all ex-officio members on the APAS Committee are able to vote. In previous discussions about committee membership, it was the sense of the committee that, although not explicitly stated in the Plan of Organization, the inclusion of voting ex-officio representatives of various units on Senate committees which deal with the business of their respective divisions was done in the spirit of giving them an active role in formulating policy which they would be expected to carry out administratively. The committee felt it was appropriate that the University Registrar should be extended the same privilege to participate in the policy formulation of the APAS Committee.

In its consideration, the committee examined the quorum of the committee and a long-standing concern of the committee regarding the ability for votes to pass with only ex-officio members voting in favor. While there are as yet no committees which can reach a quorum with only ex-officio members, there are some where a quorum could be reached in which ex-officio members represent a simple majority, and could therefore pass motions and approve reports without the consent of any duly elected Senators or volunteers chosen by the Committee on Committees. There is no clear statement of policy prohibiting such an outcome in the Plan or Bylaws. The ERG Committee has stated in the past that this is an area in which a definitive policy statement is warranted for the future, and that this is an issue that should be considered whenever the Senate is considering changes in committee membership.

After discussion, the ERG Committee voted to amend Article 6 section 1 subsection a of the Bylaws of the University Senate as follows:

- 6.1.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; ten (10) faculty members; three (3) undergraduate and two (2) graduate students; and the following persons or a representative of each: the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Director of Undergraduate Admissions, **the University Registrar**, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies, and the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School.

The committee voted unanimously in favor of amending the Bylaws as such and including a voting ex-officio member from the Registrar's Office in the membership of the APAS Committee.

In relation to the quorum of the committee, the ERG Committee felt increasing the number of voting ex-officio members from four to five raised a significant concern regarding the quorum of the committee. With a quorum of nine, a vote could pass with a simple majority of ex-officio members. To ameliorate this concern, the ERG Committee voted to amend Article 6 section 1 subsection b of the Bylaws as follows:

6.1.b Quorum: A quorum of the Academic Procedures and Standards Committee shall be ~~nine~~ **(9) ten (10)** voting members.

RECOMMENDATION

The Elections, Representation, & Governance Committee recommends that the Bylaws of the University Senate be amended to include an additional voting, ex-officio member on the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee, who shall be the University Registrar, or his or her designee. The Committee further recommends that the Bylaws be amended to change the quorum of the APAS Committee to be ten voting members.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Proposed Amended Bylaws of the University Senate

Appendix 2 – Senate Document Number 09-10-41: Review of Quorum Calculation in Senate Standing Committees

Appendix 3 – University Senate Executive Committee Charge to Modify the Membership of the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee to Include a Representative of the Office of the Registrar

APPENDIX 1 - PROPOSED AMENDED
BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

BYLAWS

OF THE

UNIVERSITY

SENATE

Amended December 5, 2012

BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
University of Maryland, College Park
Amended December 5, 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLE 1 - AUTHORIZATION.....3

ARTICLE 2 - MEMBERSHIP.....3

ARTICLE 3 - MEETINGS.....5

ARTICLE 4 - EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE6

ARTICLE 5 - COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE.....8

ARTICLE 6 - STANDING COMMITTEE SPECIFICATIONS.....11

6.1 ACADEMIC PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE.....11

6.2 CAMPUS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.....12

6.3 COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES.....12-13

6.4 EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.....13

6.5 ELECTIONS, REPRESENTATION, AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE.....13-14

6.6 EQUITY, DIVERSITY & INCLUSION COMMITTEE (FORMERLY HUMAN RELATIONS).....14

6.7 FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.....14-15

6.8 GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE.....15-16

6.9 GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.....16

6.10 PROGRAMS, CURRICULA, AND COURSES COMMITTEE.....16-17

6.11 STAFF AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.....17-18

6.12 STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.....18

6.13 STUDENT CONDUCT COMMITTEE.....18-19

ARTICLE 7 - UNIVERSITY COUNCILS.....19-21

ARTICLE 8 - UNIVERSITY COUNCILS SPECIFICATIONS.....21-22

8.1 UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COUNCIL.....21-22

8.2 UNIVERSITY RESEARCH COUNCIL.....22

ARTICLE 9 - DUTIES OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND DIRECTOR.....22-23

ARTICLE 10 - ANNUAL TRANSITION OF THE SENATE.....23-24

APPENDIX 1 - COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS AND TERMS.....25

APPENDIX 2 - BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COUNCIL.....25-28

APPENDIX 3 - PROCEDURES FOR ELECTIONS OF UMCP REPRESENTATIVES TO THE COUNCIL OF UNIVERSITY SYSTEM FACULTY (CUSF).....28

DATES OF APPROVAL, UPDATES, AND AMENDMENTS TO THE SENATE BYLAWS.....29

BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
The University of Maryland, College Park

ARTICLE 1
AUTHORIZATION

- 1.1 These *Bylaws of the University Senate* (hereafter referred to as the *Bylaws*) are adopted according to Article 7 of the *Plan of Organization* (hereafter referred to as the *Plan*), and are subject to amendment as provided for in the *Plan*.

ARTICLE 2
MEMBERSHIP

- 2.1 The members of the Senate are as designated in Article 3 of the *Plan* and further specified in 2.1 and 2.2 below. All elected members are subject to the conditions stated in the *Plan*, including its provisions for expulsion, recall, and impeachment (Article 4.10, 4.11, and 5.6 of the *Plan* and Article 2.3 below).

2.1.a Staff Senators

For the purpose of Senate representation, the Staff Constituency is divided into the following categories. Each category shall elect one Senator from among its ranks for each 200 staff members or major fraction thereof.

1. Executive, Administrative, and Managerial Staff
2. Professional Staff
3. Secretarial and Clerical Staff
4. Technical and Para-Professional Staff
5. Skilled Crafts
6. Service and Maintenance

Exempt staff are in categories 1 and 2; non-exempt staff are in categories 3-6.

- 2.1.b Staff member job categories will not include the category designated for the President, vice presidents, provosts, and deans if they hold faculty rank.
- 2.1.c Any individual within the faculty member voting constituency cannot be included in the staff member voting constituency or nominated for election as a Senate staff member. Staff candidates for the Senate must have been employed at the University of Maryland College Park for 12 months prior to standing as candidates for Senate. Staff members may not stand for Senate elections while in the probationary period of employment.
- 2.1.d An ex officio member denoted in the *Plan* (Article 3.6.a.) who is not precluded from staff member categories as noted in Articles 2.1.b and 2.1.c may be elected as a voting member of the Senate by an appropriate constituency. Such ex officio members should also have been employed by the University of Maryland College Park for 12 months prior to standing as candidates for the Senate.
- 2.1.e As noted in the *Plan* (Article 3.3.c), the term of each staff Senator shall be three (3) years. Terms of staff members will be staggered in such a way that for each term, one-third of the total members from a job category are serving the first year of their term. Not every member of a specific job category shall be elected in the same year except in the case that the job categories are redefined by the University or these *Bylaws*. In such a circumstance, at the completion of the election, from those members who were elected:
- (1) One-third of the members in a job category who received the lowest number of votes will serve a one-year term,
 - (2) One-third of the members in a job category who received the second lowest number of votes will serve two-year terms,
 - (3) One-third of the members in a job category who received the highest number of votes will serve

three year-terms.

A person serving a one-year term is defined not to have served a full term and is eligible for re-election to a full term the following year.

2.2 Single Member Constituencies

The Senators defined in (a)-(h) below shall be voting members of the Senate. All elections held pursuant to this section shall be organized by the Senate Office.

- (a) Teaching Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Constituency as defined in Section 3.2 of the Plan shall elect two (2) Senators, for a term of one (1) year, their terms renewable for up to three (3) years. Full-time Instructor/Lecturers shall elect one (1) full-time representative and part-time Instructor/Lecturers shall elect one (1) part-time representative representing the Instructor/Lecturer constituency. When the Senate votes by constituencies, those Senators shall have the same voting rights as a Faculty Senator.
- (b) Research Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Constituency as defined in Section 3.2 of the Plan shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as a Faculty Senator.
- (c) The part-time undergraduate students shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as all other student Senators. A part-time student Senator who changes to full-time status subsequent to election may serve out his/her term.
- (d) The Contingent 2 Staff shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as all other Staff Senators. The Contingent 2 Staff Senator shall have been employed by the University for twelve months prior to their election.
- (e) Emeritus Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Constituency as defined in Section 3.2 of the Plan shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as a Faculty Senator.
- (f) The part-time graduate students shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as all other student Senators. A part-time student Senator who changes to full-time status subsequent to election may serve out his/her term.
- (g) Adjunct Professors and Professors of the Practice who are not members of the Faculty Constituency as defined in Section 3.2 of the Plan together shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as a Faculty Senator.
- (h) Head coaches who are not members of the Faculty Constituency as defined in Section 3.2 of the University Plan of Organization together shall elect one Senator from among their ranks to serve for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as a Faculty Senator.

- 2.3 If any elected Senator is absent from two (2) consecutive regularly scheduled meetings of the Senate without prior approval from the Office of the University Senate (Article 4.10.a of the Plan), the Executive Secretary and Director shall notify the constituency of this fact. Also in accordance with Article 4.9 and 4.10 of the Plan, until the member attends a meeting of the Senate, or the Senator is expelled, that Senator shall be counted in the total membership when a quorum is defined for a meeting.

ARTICLE 3 MEETINGS

3.1 Regular Meetings:

The Senate shall schedule at least four (4) regular meetings each semester. The notice, agenda, and supporting documents shall be mailed, by campus or electronic-mail, from the Senate Office to the membership no later than one calendar week prior to each regular meeting unless otherwise approved by the Executive Committee.

3.2 Special Meetings:

3.2.a Special meetings of the Senate may be called in any of the following ways, with the matter(s) to be considered to be specified in the call:

- (1) By the presiding officer of the Senate;
- (2) By a majority vote of the Executive Committee of the Senate;
- (3) By written petition of a majority of the elected members of the Senate. The petition shall be delivered to the Chair or the Executive Secretary and Director of the Senate. The Chair shall give notice of arrangements for the meeting within seventy-two (72) hours of receipt of a valid petition; and
- (4) By resolution of the Senate.

3.2.b The notice of a special meeting shall include the agenda and shall be sent to the members of the Senate as far in advance of the meeting as possible. The agenda of a special meeting may specify a scheduled time of adjournment and provide information on adjourned meetings.

3.2.c The scheduling of a special meeting shall reflect the urgency of the matter(s) specified in the call, the requirement of reasonable notice, and the availability of the membership.

3.3 Openness of Meetings and Floor Privileges:

3.3.a Meetings of the Senate shall be open to all members of the campus community except when the meetings are being conducted in closed session.

3.3.b Representatives of the news media shall be admitted to all meetings of the Senate except when the meetings are conducted in closed session. The use of television, video, or recording equipment shall not be permitted except by express consent of the Senate.

3.3.c When a report of a committee of the Senate is being considered, members of that committee who are not members of the Senate may sit with the Senate and have a voice but not a vote in the deliberations of the Senate on that report.

3.3.d Any Senator may request the privilege of the floor for any member of the campus community to speak on the subject before the Senate. The Chair shall rule on such requests.

3.3.e By vote of the Senate, by ruling of the Chair, or by order of the Executive Committee included in the agenda of the meeting, the Senate shall go into closed session. The ruling of the Chair and the order of the Executive Committee shall be subject to appeal, but the Chair shall determine whether such appeal shall be considered in open or closed session.

3.3.f While in closed session, the meeting shall be restricted to voting members of the Senate (Article 3 in the *Plan*), to members granted a voice but not a vote (Articles 3.6 and 5.2.c of the *Plan*), to the Executive Secretary and Director, to the parliamentarian and any staff required for keeping minutes and audio recordings, and to other persons expressly invited by the Senate.

3.4 Rules for Procedure:

3.4.a The version of *Robert's Rules of Order* that shall govern the conduct of Senate meetings shall be *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*.

- 3.4.b A quorum for meetings shall be defined as a majority of elected Senators who have not received prior approval for absence from the Office of the University Senate, or fifty (50) Senators, whichever number is higher. For the purpose of determining a quorum, ex officio members with or without vote shall not be considered.

ARTICLE 4 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

4.1 Membership and Election:

- 4.1.a As set forth in the *Plan* (Article 8.2), the members of the Executive Committee shall include the Chair and Chair-Elect of the Senate, and twelve (12) members elected from the voting membership of the Senate. One of the two staff members shall be elected by and from the Senators representing exempt staff, and the other shall be elected by and from the Senators representing nonexempt staff.
- 4.1.b Non-voting members of the Executive Committee shall be the President and the Senior Vice President and Provost or their representatives; the Executive Secretary and Director of the Senate, who shall be secretary of the Executive Committee; and the Parliamentarian.
- 4.1.c The election of the Executive Committee shall be scheduled as a special order at the transitional meeting of the Senate in the Spring Semester, but in no case shall it precede the election of the Chair-Elect as provided for in the *Plan* (Article 5.3). In the event of a tie vote in the election for members of the Executive Committee, a ballot will be mailed to each Senator as soon as the votes are counted and the tie discovered. Ballots are to be returned within one (1) week from the date mailed.
- 4.1.d In the event of a vacancy on the Executive Committee, the available candidate who had received the next highest number of votes in the annual election for the Executive Committee shall fill the remainder of the unexpired term.

4.2 Charge: The Executive Committee shall exercise the following functions:

- 4.2.a Assist in carrying into effect the actions of the Senate;
- 4.2.b Act for the Senate as provided for by and subject to the limitations stated in Article 4.3;
- 4.2.c Act as an initiating body suggesting possible action by the Senate;
- 4.2.d Review and report to the Senate on administrative implementation of policies adopted by the Senate;
- 4.2.e Prepare the agenda for each Senate meeting as provided for by and subject to limitations stated in Article 4.4;
- 4.2.f Serve as a channel through which any member of the campus community may introduce matters for consideration by the Senate or its committees;
- 4.2.g Prepare and submit reports on the Senate's work to the President and the campus community;
- 4.2.h Review the operations of the Office of the University Senate in January of each year, and make recommendations to the President for improvements in those operations and for the replacement or continuation of the Executive Secretary and Director;
- 4.2.i Serve as the channel through which the Senate and the campus community may participate in the selection of officers of the campus and the University;
- 4.2.j Perform such other functions as may be given it in other provisions of these *Bylaws* and the *Plan*; and

- 4.2.k Conduct elections, by Senators representing faculty constituencies, for membership on system-wide bodies requiring faculty representatives.

4.3 Rules Governing Executive Committee Action for the Senate:

- 4.3.a Where time or the availability of the membership precludes a meeting of the Senate, as, for example, during the summer or between semesters, the Executive Committee may act for the Senate.
- 4.3.b A report of all actions taken by the Executive Committee when acting for the Senate, with supporting material, shall be included with the agenda of the next regular meeting of the Senate. By written request of ten (10) Senators, received by the Chair of the Senate prior to the call to order of that meeting, any Executive Committee action on behalf of the Senate shall be vacated and the item in question placed on the agenda as a special order. If any such item is not petitioned to the floor, it shall stand as an approved action of the Senate.

4.4 Rules Governing Preparation of the Senate Agenda:

- 4.4.a The order of business for regular meetings shall be as follows:
- (1) Call to order;
 - (2) Approval of the minutes of the previous regular meeting and any other intervening special meeting(s);
 - (3) Report of the Chair;
 - (4) Report of the Executive Committee;
 - (5) Special orders of the day;
 - (6) Unfinished business;
 - (7) Reports of committees;
 - (8) Other new business; and
 - (9) Adjournment.
- 4.4.b For regular meetings the Executive Committee shall consider all submissions for inclusion on the Senate agenda. The Executive Committee may not alter a submission, but may delay its inclusion, may include it on the agenda of a special meeting, may submit the material directly to a committee of the Senate, or may refuse to place it on the agenda if the material is inappropriate, incomplete, or unclear. The party making a submission shall be notified of the action taken in this regard by the Executive Committee.
- 4.4.c The order of business for a special meeting shall be as follows:
- (1) Call to order;
 - (2) Statement by the Chair of the nature and origin of the call of the meeting;
 - (3) The special order;
 - (4) Other business as determined by the Executive Committee; and
 - (5) Adjournment.
- 4.4.d For a special meeting the agenda shall include the matter(s) specified in the call of that meeting as the Special Order. Other items may be included on the agenda as the Executive Committee deems

appropriate.

- 4.5 Meetings of the Executive Committee: A quorum of the Executive Committee shall be seven (7) voting members. Minutes of the meetings shall be kept. A report of the Executive Committee shall be submitted to the next regular meeting of the Senate. The Executive Committee shall meet at the call of the Chair or by petition of seven (7) voting members of the Executive Committee, or by petition of twenty-five (25) voting members of the Senate.
- 4.6 The Senate Budget: The Executive Secretary and Director shall be responsible for the Senate budget, shall consult with the Executive Committee on the preparation of the budget request, and shall report to the Executive Committee the funds received. The Executive Secretary and Director shall make an annual report to the Senate on expenditure of the Senate budget. Consent of the Executive Committee shall be required before any change in the budgeted use of Senate funds involving more than ten percent (10%) of the total may be undertaken.
- 4.7 **Referral of Items to Standing Committees:** The Executive Committee shall refer items to the standing committees.
- 4.7.a The Executive Committee shall refer an item to an appropriate committee when instructed by the Senate or when requested by the President, or when petitioned by 150 members of the Senate electorate.
- 4.7.b The Executive Committee may also refer any item it deems appropriate, and the standing committee shall give due consideration to such requests from the Executive Committee.
- 4.7.c The Chair of the Senate may, as need requires, act for the Executive Committee and refer items to standing committees. All such actions shall be reported at the next meeting of the Executive Committee.
- 4.8 To the extent permitted by law and University policy, the records of the Senate shall be open.

ARTICLE 5 COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

- 5.1 **Standing Committees - Specifications:** The specifications of each standing committee of the Senate shall state its name, its specific charge, and any exceptions or additions to the basic charge to standing committees stated in Article 5.2. The specifications shall list all voting ex officio members and may restrict committee composition.
- 5.1.a General Standing Committees: In an appropriate section of Article 6 there shall be specifications for each general committee.
- 5.2 **Standing Committees - Basic Charge:** In its area of responsibility, as defined in its specifications, each committee shall be an arm of the Senate with the following powers:
- (1) To formulate and review policies to be established by the Senate according to the *Plan* (Article 1);
 - (2) To review established policies and their administration and to recommend any changes in policies or their administration that may be desirable;
 - (3) To serve in an advisory capacity, upon request, regarding the administration of policies;
 - (4) To function on request of the President or of the Executive Committee as a board of appeal with reference to actions and/or decisions made in the application of policies; and
 - (5) To recommend the creation of special subcommittees (Article 5.8) when deemed necessary.

5.3 **Standing Committees - General Committee Operation:**

5.3.a Agenda Determination:

- (1) Nonprocedural items shall be placed on the agenda of a general committee by vote of that committee, by referral from the Executive Committee (Article 4.7), or by referral of policy recommendations. The committee shall determine the priorities of its agenda items.
- (2) A general committee shall have principal responsibility for identifying matters of present and potential concern to the campus community within its area of responsibility. Such matters should be placed on the agenda of the general committee.

5.3.b Rules for Procedure of Standing Committees: The version of *Robert's Rules of Order* that shall govern the conduct of Standing Committees shall be *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*.

5.3.c Quorum Requirements of Standing Committees: Unless a quorum number is specified in the membership description of a committee, the quorum shall be a majority of voting members of the committee.

5.4 **Standing Committees - Reporting Responsibilities:** Each committee shall be responsible through its presiding officer for the timely delivery of the following reports.

5.4.a The Executive Secretary and Director shall receive an announcement of each meeting of the committee stating the time and place of the meeting with agenda items. It shall be sent as far in advance of the meeting as possible.

5.4.b The committee shall report its progress on agenda items as required by the Executive Secretary and Director or the Chair of the Senate.

5.4.c Reports providing information and/or recommendations to the Senate shall be submitted to the Executive Committee for inclusion on the Senate agenda. Reports resulting from the committee's advisory or board of appeals function shall be submitted to the appropriate Senate or campus officer, and the Executive Committee notified of the submission.

5.4.d Upon written request of at least four (4) members of a committee, the presiding officer of that committee shall include a minority statement with any committee report. Those requesting inclusion need not support the substance of the minority statement.

5.4.e An annual report shall be presented to the Chair of the Senate at the end of the academic year, or, if approved by the Chair, no later than August 16, for submission to the Senate. The report shall include a list of all items placed on the committee's agenda, noting the disposition of each. In the case of committees with little activity, the committee may recommend inactive status the ensuing year.

5.5 **Standing Committees - Selecting Members:** Persons shall be named to standing committees in accordance with the procedures listed below.

5.5.a The Committee on Committees, through the Senate office, shall maintain a database of the qualifications, preferred committees, and past committee service of members of the Senate electorate. Opportunity to update this database shall be provided annually. In the case of students, new information will be solicited through the most practical means. In the case of staff and faculty, current information will be forwarded with a request that the elector update the information. In conjunction with this annual update, the Senate office shall circulate prepared information on the duties, powers, and membership specifications of each committee and council to each unit, to all new electors, and to students requesting the information.

5.5.b The Committee on Committees shall submit nominations as necessary to maintain full and effective committee membership. No person shall be nominated for a committee position without consenting to serve on that committee, either through indicated preference or explicit agreement. In making nominations, the Committee on Committees shall keep in view the continuing membership of the committee to ensure that the full membership complies with specifications of the *Plan* and these

Bylaws. Committee members shall be nominated consistent with requirements for diversity specified in Section 8.1 of the *Plan*.

- 5.5.c Ex officio members named in a committee's specifications shall be voting members unless otherwise specified in the *Bylaws*. Upon recommendation of the Committee on Committees, the Executive Committee may appoint ex officio members with particular expertise or benefit to the committee. Such members shall serve with voice, but without vote. The Executive Committee is empowered to make such changes in non-voting ex officio membership as appropriate.
- 5.5.d The Committee on Committees shall forward nominations to the Executive Committee to place on the Senate agenda for approval. Each nominee shall be identified by name, constituency, and Senate committee experience. The notice of nomination shall also include the name and constituency of continuing members of the committee, and the name and office of the current ex officio members, listed for information only. The nominations shall be subject to action by the Senate consistent with the *Plan* and the specifications of these *Bylaws*.
- 5.5.e Terms on standing committees shall be two (2) years for faculty and staff, and one (1) year for students. Appointments to two-year terms shall be staggered: that is, as far as practical, half of the terms from each faculty or staff constituency shall expire each year. Terms shall begin on the date of the transitional meeting of the Senate in the appropriate year.
- 5.5.f A member of a standing committee whose term is expiring may be appointed to another term, subject to restrictions (1) and (2) below. The Committee on Committees is particularly charged to consider the reappointment of active student members.
 - (1) No reappointment shall be made that would cause the appointee to serve longer than four consecutive years on the same committee.
 - (2) At most, half of the non-student members of a committee whose terms are expiring in any given year may be reappointed.
- 5.5.g Terms as presiding officer of a committee shall be one year. A presiding officer may be reappointed if his/her tenure as a committee member is continuing; however, no one shall serve as presiding officer of a committee for more than two (2) consecutive years.
- 5.5.h Appointments of the presiding officers of committees shall be designated as the annual committee slate and shall be approved by the Senate at an appropriate meeting. Appointments to unexpired terms shall be for the remainder of the unexpired term and shall be acted upon by the Senate as placed on the agenda by the Executive Committee.

5.6 **Standing Committees - Replacing Presiding Officers and Members:** The presiding officer and members of any active standing committee may be replaced for cause after inquiry by the Executive Committee, subject to approval by the Senate (see Article 5.6.c).

5.6.a Cause, for presiding officers, is defined as the following:

- (1) Failure to activate the committee during the first semester after appointment in order to organize its business and determine an agenda; or
- (2) Failure to activate the committee in order to respond to communications referred from the Executive Committee; or
- (3) Failure to activate the committee in order to carry out specific charges required in Article 6 or other Senate documents.

5.6.b Cause, for members, is defined as the following:

- (1) Continual absence from committee meetings and/or lack of participation in committee activities;
or

- (2) Lack of registration on campus for students or termination of employment on campus for faculty and staff.

5.6.c Procedure for replacing presiding officers and members:

- (1) The decision to replace a presiding officer rests with the Executive Committee; and
- (2) Requests for replacing a committee member shall be submitted by the presiding officer of a committee to the Executive Committee; such requests will contain a statement citing the appropriate "cause."

5.6.d When the Executive Committee decides to replace a presiding officer or committee member, it shall request the Committee on Committees to identify a suitable replacement.

5.7 **Standing Committees - Appointing Special Subcommittees:** A standing committee of the Senate may appoint special subcommittees to assist in the effective performance of its responsibilities. Persons appointed to special subcommittees who are not members of standing committees must be approved by the Executive Committee. The Chair of any special subcommittee must be a member of the standing committee making the appointment.

5.8 **Special Committees:** A special committee of the Senate may be established by resolution of the Senate to carry out a specified task. The empowering resolution shall also stipulate the means of selecting the committee and any restrictions on its composition. The committee shall function until the completion of its tasks or until discharged by the Senate. A final report of its work shall be presented to the Senate. Members shall serve for the duration of the committee unless otherwise specified by the Senate.

ARTICLE 6 STANDING COMMITTEE SPECIFICATIONS

6.1 **Academic Procedures and Standards Committee:**

- 6.1.a **Membership:** The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; ten (10) faculty members; three (3) undergraduate and two (2) graduate students; and the following persons or a representative of each: the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Director of Undergraduate Admissions, **the University Registrar**, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies, and the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School.
- 6.1.b **Quorum:** A quorum of the Academic Procedures and Standards Committee shall be **nine (9) ten (10)** voting members.
- 6.1.c **Charge:** The committee shall formulate and continually review policies, rules, and regulations governing the admission, readmission, academic standing, and dismissal of all students for academic deficiency.
- 6.1.d **Charge:** The committee shall continually review policies and procedures for academic advisement, scheduling of classes, and registration.
- 6.1.e **Charge:** The committee shall formulate and continually review policies to be observed by the instructional staff in conducting classes, seminars, examinations, students' research, and student evaluations.
- 6.1.f **Policies, rules, and regulations exclusively governing admission, readmission, scholastic standing, and dismissal of graduate students for academic deficiency shall be reviewed by an appropriate committee of the Graduate School. Such policies, rules, and regulations will be transmitted by the Graduate School directly to the Senate through the Executive Committee. Policies, rules, and regulations that concern both graduate and undergraduate matters shall be considered by both the Educational Affairs Committee and the appropriate committee of the Graduate School.**

6.2 Campus Affairs Committee:

6.2.a Membership:

- (1) The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; six (6) faculty members; two (2) undergraduate and two (2) graduate students; two (2) staff members; the President or a representative of the Student Government Association; the President of the Graduate Student Government or the President's graduate student designee; and the following persons or a representative of each: the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Vice President for Administrative Affairs, the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Vice President for University Relations, the Chief Diversity Officer, and the Chair of the Coaches Council.
- (2) When discussions of safety are on the agenda, the Chief of Police, the President's Legal Office, the Director of Transportation Services, and other campus constituencies, as appropriate, shall be invited to participate or send a representative.
- (3) The Chair of this committee or a member designated by the Chair and approved by the Senate Executive Committee will serve as an ex officio member of the Athletic Council and the Campus Transportation Advisory Committee.

6.2.b Quorum: A quorum of the Campus Affairs Committee shall be nine (9) voting members.

6.2.c Charge: The committee shall formulate and continually review policies and regulations affecting the total campus, its functions, its facilities, its internal operation and external relationships, including the awarding of campus prizes and honors, and make recommendations concerning the future of the campus.

6.2.d Charge: The committee shall establish procedures for the periodic review of campus level administrators.

6.2.e Charge: The committee shall gather community input on safety and security issues and shall act as a liaison between the police and the campus community. The committee shall provide an annual report to the Senate regarding this charge.

6.3 Committee on Committees:

6.3.a Membership and terms:

- (1) As set forth in the *Plan* (Article 8.3.a), the Committee on Committees shall be chaired by the Chair-Elect of the Senate.
- (2) Besides the Chair-Elect of the Senate, the voting membership, as defined in the *Plan* (Article 8.3.a), shall consist of six (6) faculty members, with no more than one (1) from any college, elected by faculty Senators; two (2) staff members elected by staff Senators; and two (2) students elected by student Senators.
- (3) Students are elected to serve for one (1) year, faculty and staff for two (2) years, whether or not their membership in the Senate continues beyond their first year of service in the committee.
- (4) Terms of faculty and staff members are staggered in such a way that, at any time, no more than three (3) faculty members and one (1) staff member are serving the second year of their term.
- (5) In the event of a vacancy on the Committee on Committees, the available candidate who had received the next highest number of votes in the last annual election for the Committee on Committees, subject to provisions in 6.3.a(2), shall fill the remainder of the unexpired term.

6.3.b Charge:

- (1) As set forth in the *Plan* (Article 8.3.b), responsibilities of the Committee on Committees include:

- (a) Identification and recruitment of individuals for service on Senate committees,
 - (b) Identification and recruitment of individuals to serve as representatives of the Senate on University committees.
 - (c) Identification and recruitment of individuals to serve as representatives of the Senate on University committees.
- (2) Additional duties include
- (a) Identification of individuals for service on System committees,
 - (b) Ongoing assessment of the effectiveness of committees, and recommendation for improvements and changes in the operations and structure of the Elections, Representation and Governance Committee and the Executive Committee.

6.3.c Operation: The Committee on Committees shall follow the procedures specified for standing committees in Article 5 above, with the exception of 5.5.

6.4 **Educational Affairs Committee:**

- 6.4.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; twelve (12) faculty members; two (2) staff members; two (2) undergraduate students and one (1) graduate student; the President or a representative of the Student Government Association; the President of the Graduate Student Government or the President's graduate student designee; and the following persons or a representative of each: the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Director of the Honors College, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School, and the Vice President of Information Technology and CIO. The presiding officers of the Program, Curricula, and Courses (PCC) and the General Education Committees shall be non-voting, ex officio members.
- 6.4.b Quorum: A quorum of the Educational Affairs Committee shall be eleven (11) voting members.
- 6.4.c Charge: The committee shall formulate and continually review plans and policies to strengthen the educational system of the College Park campus. The committee shall receive ideas, recommendations, and plans for educational innovations from members of the campus community and others. The committee shall inform itself of conditions in the colleges, schools, and other academic units, and shall propose measures to make effective use of the resources of the campus for educational purposes.

6.5 **Elections, Representation, and Governance Committee:**

- 6.5.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; seven (7) faculty members; two (2) staff members; two (2) undergraduate and two (2) graduate students; and the Director of Human Resources and the Associate Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment.
- 6.5.b Quorum: A quorum of the Elections, Representation, and Governance Committee shall be eight (8) voting members.
- 6.5.c Charge: The committee shall review and recommend policies regarding the conduct of elections, determine correct apportionments for all constituencies, and investigate and adjudicate all charges arising from the management and results of Senate elections.
- 6.5.d Charge: The committee shall determine the correct apportionment for all constituencies every five (5) years in association with any review or revision of the *Plan* (Articles 3.8 and 6.3 of the *Plan*).

- 6.5.e Charge: The committee shall supervise all Senatorial elections and referenda in accordance with the *Plan* (Article 4.2), and shall cooperate with certain constituencies in their nomination and election processes in accordance with the *Plan* (Article 4.4) or as requested by the Executive Committee.
- 6.5.f Charge: The committee shall establish appropriate procedures for the tallying and reporting of election results (Article 4.8 of the *Plan*), and other such duties as appropriate (Articles 3.3.b and 3.4.b(2) of the *Plan*).
- 6.5.g Charge: The committee shall review the plans of organization of the colleges, schools, and other units, in accordance with the *Plan* (Article 11).
- 6.5.h Charge: The committee shall review and observe the operation and effectiveness of the University Senate and make any appropriate recommendations for improvements.
- 6.5.i Charge: The committee shall receive all petitions for impeachment of the Chair or Chair-Elect in accordance with the *Plan* (Article 5.6).
- 6.5.j Charge: The committee shall initiate procedures for expelling Senators in accordance with the *Plan* (Article 4.10).
- 6.5.k Charge: The committee shall receive all petitions for the recall of Senators in accordance with the *Plan* (Article 4.11).

6.6 **Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion Committee:**

- 6.6.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; four (4) undergraduate and two (2) graduate students; six (6) faculty members; three (3) non-exempt staff members; the Director of the Office of Diversity Education and Compliance; one (1) exempt staff member or a Director from the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost; one (1) exempt staff member or a Director from the Division of Administrative Affairs; one (1) exempt staff member or a Director from the Division of Student Affairs; and the following persons or a representative of each: the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Vice President for Administrative Affairs, and the Vice President for Student Affairs.
- 6.6.b Quorum: A quorum of the Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion Committee shall be eleven (11) voting members.
- 6.6.c Charge: The committee shall carry out its responsibilities as detailed in Article 1, Section E of the Code on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, University of Maryland, College Park, and recommend any appropriate changes in the Code. It shall consider programs for improving equity, diversity, and inclusiveness at the University.

6.7 **Faculty Affairs Committee:**

- 6.7.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; ten (10) faculty members, of whom four (4) shall be senators and two (2) must be untenured; one (1) undergraduate student and two (2) graduate students; one (1) staff member; and the following persons or a representative of each: the President, the Senior Vice President and Provost, and the Director of Human Resources.
- 6.7.b Quorum: A quorum of the Faculty Affairs Committee shall be eight (8) voting members.
- 6.7.c Charge: The committee shall formulate and continually review policies pertaining to faculty life, employment, academic freedom, morale, and perquisites.
- 6.7.d Charge: The committee shall work for the advancement of academic freedom and the protection of faculty and research interests.
- 6.7.e Charge: The committee shall, in consultation with colleges, schools, and other academic units,

establish procedures for the periodic review of academic administrators below the campus level.

6.8 General Education Committee:

6.8.a Membership: The committee shall consist of:

- (1) A presiding officer, who is a member of the faculty and is appointed by the chair of the Senate;
- (2) Twelve (12) faculty members consisting of:
 - (a) One (1) representative from each of the following entities: the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources; the School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation; the College of Arts and Humanities; the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences; the Robert H. Smith School of Business and Management; the College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences; the College of Education; the A. James Clark School of Engineering; the College of Information Studies; the Philip Merrill College of Journalism; the School of Public Health; and the School of Public Policy;
- (3) Four (4) students, of whom at least one (1) must be an undergraduate student and at least one (1) must be a graduate student, from four (4) different entities listed in 6.8.a(2)(a) above and those under the Office of Undergraduate Studies.
- (4) The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies, the Director of the Honors College, the Executive Director of College Park Scholars (or their designees), and the Associate Dean for General Education shall serve as voting ex officio members.

6.8.b Charge:

- (1) To facilitate the ongoing Core Liberal Arts and Sciences Program for students under the Core requirements, the General Education Committee shall exercise continuing supervisory authority and general oversight of the Core Liberal Arts and Sciences Program at the University of Maryland consistent with its authority as mandated by the report on undergraduate education entitled Promises to Keep: The College Park Plan for Undergraduate Education (Pease Report), adopted by the College Park Senate in March 1988 and in coordination with the General Education Program at the University of Maryland as described in the 2010 document Transforming General Education at the University of Maryland and the General Education Implementation Plan approved by the University Senate in February 2011. It shall also make periodic reports to the Senate on its evaluation of the effectiveness of the program and make any recommendations for revision or improvements it deems appropriate.
- (2) The General Education Committee shall exercise broad oversight and supervision of the General Education Program at the University of Maryland as described in the 2010 document Transforming General Education at the University of Maryland and the General Education Implementation Plan approved by the University Senate in February 2011. The General Education Committee shall review and make recommendations concerning the General Education Program to the Senate and the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies. Such recommendations shall include, as the committee deems appropriate, the program's requirements and its vision, especially with regard to evaluating trends, reviewing learning outcomes, and maintaining the balance of courses in the General Education categories.

6.8.c The committee may, under the provisions of Section 5.7, establish subcommittees for each major segment of its work. A member of the General Education Committee shall serve as the presiding officer of each subcommittee. The other members may, but need not, be members of the General Education Committee as the General Education Committee and the Senate Executive Committee deem appropriate.

6.8.d Relation of the General Education Committee to the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies:

- (1) The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies will prepare an annual report on the status of the General Education Program and will send the report to the General Education Committee by September 1.
- (2) The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies will meet with the General Education Committee as needed to discuss or update the report. Topics will include but not be limited to: the membership and ongoing work of the General Education Faculty Boards; the proposal and approval process for General Education courses; the learning outcomes for the different course categories; areas where additional courses or rebalancing may be needed; trends and developments that may impact the General Education Program; and informational resources for students, faculty, and advisors about the General Education Program.
- (3) The Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies shall inform the committee of modifications in the proposal or review process, the disposition of recommendations from the committee, and any other changes regarding the implementation of the General Education Program as specifically delegated to that office.

6.9 **Governmental Affairs Committee:**

- 6.9.a Membership: The committee shall consist of the Chair-Elect of the Senate; the current Chair of the Senate; the immediate past Chair of the Senate; a federal and a state campus legislative liaison appointed by the President; two (2) faculty members; one (1) undergraduate student; one (1) graduate student; one (1) non-exempt staff member; one (1) exempt staff member; and such additional non-voting, ex officio members as shall be appointed under Section 5.5.c of these *Bylaws*. Committee members shall not be limited to two consecutive terms as specified in Section 5.5.f(1) of these *Bylaws*. To assure continuity, selection of members should be made in a way that will return at least four (4) of the members of the immediate past committee to the newly appointed committee.
- 6.9.b Charge: The committee shall initiate activities to provide contact with and information for executive and legislative bodies; shall serve as an advisory body to the President concerning campus needs requiring legislation; and shall keep the Senate abreast of legislative issues important to the campus.

6.10 **Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee:**

- 6.10.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; ten (10) faculty members; two (2) undergraduate students and one (1) graduate student; and the following persons or a representative of each: the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School, and the Dean of Libraries.
- 6.10.b Quorum: A quorum of the Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee shall be nine (9) voting members.
- 6.10.c Charge: The committee shall formulate, review, and make recommendations to the Senate concerning policies related both (1) to the establishment, modification, or discontinuance of academic programs, curricula, and courses; and (2) to the establishment, reorganization, or abolition of colleges, schools, academic departments, or other units that offer credit-bearing programs of instruction or regularly offer courses for credit.
- 6.10.d Charge: The committee shall review and make recommendations to the Senate in at least the areas designated by (1) through (3) below. Recommendations in these areas are not subject to amendment on the Senate floor unless a detailed objection describing the area of concern has been filed with the Senate Office at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting at which the

recommendations will be introduced. The committee will announce proposed recommendations to the campus community sufficiently in advance of the meeting at which they are to be considered so as to allow time for concerned parties to file their objections.

- (1) All proposals for the establishment of a new academic program, for the discontinuance of an existing academic program, for the merger or splitting of existing academic programs, or for the renaming of an existing academic program;
- (2) All proposals for the creation, abolition, merger, splitting, or change of name of colleges, schools, departments of instruction, or other units that offer credit-bearing programs of instruction or regularly offer courses for credit; and
- (3) All proposals to reassign existing units or programs to other units or programs.

6.10.e Charge: The committee shall review and shall directly advise the Office of Academic Affairs concerning proposals to modify the curricula of existing academic programs, or to establish citation programs consistent with college rules approved by the Senate. The committee shall inform the Senate of its actions in these cases.

6.10.f Charge: The committee shall review, establish, and advise the Vice President's Advisory Committee concerning policies for adding, deleting, or modifying academic courses.

6.10.g Charge: The committee shall be especially concerned with the thoroughness and soundness of all proposals, and shall evaluate each according to the mission of the University, the justification for the proposed action, the availability of resources, the appropriateness of the sponsoring group, and the proposal's conformity with existing regulations. The committee shall be informed of any recommendations made by the Academic Planning Advisory Committee concerning resource issues, the consistency of the proposed action with the University's mission and strategic directions, or both.

6.10.h The committee shall meet regularly as needed.

6.10.i Relation of the Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee to the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost.

- (1) The committee, in consultation with the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, shall determine the requirements for supporting documentation and the procedures for review for all proposals.
- (2) The committee shall be informed by the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost of all proposed modifications to existing programs and curricula. After consulting with the presiding officer of the committee, the Provost's Office shall act on all minor changes that are not of a policy nature.
- (3) The committee shall be informed by the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost of all changes made pursuant to 6.10.h(2). The committee shall be informed by the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost of all other changes in academic curricula whose approval has been specifically delegated to that office. In particular, this includes the approval to offer existing academic programs through distance education or at a new off-campus location.

6.10.j Relationship of the Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee to the Graduate School: Proposals concerned with graduate programs and curricula shall receive the review specified by the Graduate School, in addition to the review of the Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee. Any such proposal whose approval has been denied by the Graduate School shall not be considered by the committee.

6.11 **Staff Affairs Committee:**

6.11.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; ten (10) staff members, including a member, preferably a Senator, from each of the elected staff categories; three (3) faculty

members; two (2) students; the Director of Human Resources; and one (1) representative each from the offices of the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Vice President for Administrative Affairs, the Vice President for University Relations, and the Vice President for Student Affairs. The elected UMCP representatives to the Council of University System Staff (CUSS), the two staff representatives on the Executive Committee, and two Category II contingent employees shall also be members of the committee.

- 6.11.b Quorum: A quorum of the Staff Affairs Committee shall be twelve (12) voting members.
- 6.11.c Charge: The committee shall formulate and continually review campus policies affecting staff members, including policies regarding periodic review of campus departments and administrators that employ staff members.
- 6.11.d Charge: The committee shall assist the Office of the University Senate in soliciting nominations and encouraging participation in elections of staff Senators as specified in Article 4.4 of the *Plan*.
- 6.11.e Charge: Staff Affairs shall assist the Committee on Committees and the Senate Executive Committee in identifying and recruiting staff representatives for campus and Senate committees, including system-wide activities involving staff.
- 6.11.f Charge: The committee shall administer the Council of University System Staff (CUSS) nomination and election process. Definitions of eligible staff shall be defined by the Board of Regents and CUSS.
- 6.11.g Charge: The committee shall actively promote and provide orientation and opportunities for staff involvement in shared governance at every administrative level.

6.12 **Student Affairs Committee:**

- 6.12.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; ten (10) undergraduate students, of whom five (5) must be Senators; four (4) graduate students, of whom two (2) must be Senators; three (3) faculty members; two (2) staff members; the President or a representative of the Student Government Association; the President of the Graduate Student Government or the President's graduate student designee; two representatives of the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs; and one representative each from the Graduate School and the Division of Administrative Affairs, the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Division of University Relations, and the Department of Resident Life.
- 6.12.b Quorum: A quorum of the Student Affairs Committee shall be twelve (12) voting members.
- 6.12.c Charge: The committee shall formulate and continually review policies regarding all non-academic matters of student life including, but not limited to, student organizations, resident life, extracurricular activities, and student concerns in the campus community.
- 6.12.d Charge: The committee shall assist the Office of the University Senate and the colleges and schools as appropriate in soliciting nominations and encouraging participation in the election of student Senators.

6.13 **Student Conduct Committee:**

- 6.13.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; four (4) faculty members; five (5) students, of whom at least three (3) must be undergraduate students and one (1) must be a graduate student; and the Director of the Office of Student Conduct, or a representative, as a non-voting consulting member.
- 6.13.b Charge: The committee shall formulate and continually review recommendations concerning the rules and codes of student conduct, as well as means of enforcing those rules and codes.
- 6.13.c Charge: The committee acts as an appellate body for infractions of the approved Codes of Student Conduct and Code of Academic Integrity. Procedures for the committee's operation in this role are to

be developed and filed with the Office of Student Conduct and the Executive Secretary and Director of the Senate. The committee shall also confirm members of all judicial boards listed in the Codes of Student Conduct, except conference and ad hoc boards.

ARTICLE 7 UNIVERSITY COUNCILS

- 7.1 **Definition:** University councils are established by Article 8.4 of the *Plan* to exercise an integrated advisory role over specified campus units and their associated activities. University councils are jointly sponsored by the University Senate, the College Park campus administration, and the chief administrative officer(s) of the designated unit(s) (hereafter indicated by "director"). University councils may be assigned reporting responsibilities to any member(s) of the College Park administration at the dean level or above (hereafter referred to as the "designated administrative officer").
- 7.2 **Creation of University Councils:** Proposals to create a University council shall be evaluated by a task force appointed jointly by the University Senate Executive Committee and the designated administrative officer to whom the new council would report. Following its deliberations, this task force shall present a report to the Senate, the designated administrative officer, and the director of the unit whose activities are the focus of the council. That report shall indicate the specifications that define the working relationship among the Senate, the designated administrative officer, and the director. The report shall include at least the following: the scope and purpose of the new council; a review of the current committees and advisory relationships to be superseded by the proposed council; identification of the designated administrative officer and unit director to whom the council reports; the charge to the council; the size, composition, and appointment process of members of the council; the council's relationship to the Senate, the designated administrative officer, and the director including the responsibilities of these three sponsors to the council and the responsibilities of the council to these three sponsors; and principles for operation of the council. The proposal of the task force shall be reviewed by the appropriate Senate committees, approved by the designated administrative officer, and then approved by the Senate. At the same time, the Senate shall approve appropriate revisions in its *Bylaws* to incorporate the council into its committee structure. The report of the task force, as approved, shall be preserved with official Senate documents, serving as a record of the original agreements establishing the council.
- 7.3 **Specifications in Senate Bylaws:** For each council, Senate bylaws shall: state its name; specify its responsibilities to the Senate; define its membership, including any voting privileges of ex officio members; and identify any exceptions or additions to the provisions of Article 7 of these *Bylaws* particular to the council.
- 7.4 **Basic Charge:**
- 7.4.a The council's responsibilities to the University Senate shall include those specified for Senate committees in Article 5.2 of these *Bylaws*. In addition, each council shall:
- (1) Sponsor hearings, as appropriate, on issues within its purview that are of concern to the Senate and the campus community.
 - (2) Provide a mechanism for communication with the campus community on major issues facing the unit and its activities.
 - (3) Respond to charges sent to the council by the Senate Executive Committee.
 - (4) Provide an annual written report to the Senate on the council's activities including the status of unresolved issues before the committee.
- 7.4.b Responsibilities to the designated administrative officer shall be specified in the Task Force Report and may include:
- (1) To advise on the unit's budget, space, and other material resources, in addition to personnel, staffing and other human resources.

- (2) To advise on the unit's administrative policies and practices.
- (3) To advise on the charges to be given to periodic internal and external review committees.
- (4) To respond to requests for review, analysis, and advice from the designated administrative officer.
- (5) To meet at least annually with the designated administrative officer to review the major issues facing the unit and its activities on campus.
- (6) To fulfill such other responsibilities as specified in the Task Force Report.

7.4.c Responsibilities to the unit's director shall be specified in the Task Force Report and may include:

- (1) To advise on the needs and concerns of the campus community.
- (2) To advise on opportunities, policies, and practices related to the unit's ongoing operations.
- (3) To review and advise on unit reports, studies, and proposed initiatives.
- (4) To respond to requests for review, analysis, and advice made by the director.
- (5) To meet at least annually with the director to review the major issues facing the unit and its activities on campus.
- (6) To fulfill such other responsibilities as specified in the Task Force Report.

7.5 **Membership and Appointment to University Councils:**

- 7.5.a **Membership:** Councils shall have nine (nine) (9) to thirteen (13) members as specified in the appropriate subsection of Article 8 of these *Bylaws*. In addition, each council shall include an ex officio member designated by the administrative officer, and such other ex officio members as specified in the appropriate subsection of Article 5 of these *Bylaws*. These ex officio members shall have voice but no vote.
- 7.5.b **Appointment:** Representatives of the designated administrative officer's office and the Committee on Committees of the University Senate shall agree on nominees for vacancies on the council. These nominations shall be submitted to the designated administrative officer and to the University Senate for approval. In exercising its powers of appointment to the council, the Senate shall follow procedures for review and approval for Senate committee appointments specified in Article 5.5.d and 5.5.g of these *Bylaws*.
- 7.5.c **Terms:** Rules governing beginning date and length of terms, and restrictions on reappointment shall be those specified for Senate committees, except that the presiding officer shall serve a three (3) year term and cannot be reappointed.
- 7.5.d **Appointment of Presiding Officer:** The designated administrative officer and the Senate Executive Committee shall reach an agreement on a presiding officer, and the joint choice shall be submitted to the Senate for approval. If the presiding officer is selected from among the membership of the council, a replacement shall be appointed to the vacated seat.

7.6 **Operational Relationship of University Councils to Sponsors:**

- 7.6.a The University Senate Office shall support activities of the council in a manner similar to all other Senate committees.
- 7.6.b The office of the designated administrative officer, through its ex officio council member, shall provide

liaison to other administrative units as required.

- 7.6.c The unit director shall provide the council with internal data, reports, studies, and any other materials required to support the council's work. In addition, the director shall also arrange for unit staff to appear before the committee as requested.
- 7.6.d Control of the University council's agenda shall be the responsibility of the presiding officer of the council and the voting members of the council, subject to the charges provided in Article 7.4 of these *Bylaws*, the appropriate subsection of Article 8 of these *Bylaws*, and the approved Task Force Report governing the council.
- 7.6.e Each University council shall develop its own bylaws which must be approved by the designated administrative officer and by the Senate.
- 7.6.f In addition to the required annual report, the presiding officer shall keep the Chair of the Senate informed of the major issues before the council and shall indicate when action or information items are likely to be forwarded for Senate consideration. In submitting recommendations for Senate action, the council shall inform the unit director and the designated administrative officer in advance of its recommendations. For purposes of conducting Senate business, reports from the University council and floor privileges of the Senate shall be managed in the same manner as general committees of the Senate defined in these *Bylaws* (3.3.c, 4.4.b, 4.7, and 5.3.a). In the case where the presiding officer of the University council is not a member of the Senate, he or she may report to the Senate and participate in the deliberations of the Senate subject to the provisions of Article 3.3.c of these *Bylaws*.

7.7 **Review of University Councils:**

- 7.7.a Five (5) years after a University council is formed, a review of the council shall be undertaken jointly by the Senate and administration, and a written report issued. The review may recommend continuation of the council in its original form and mode of operation, modification of the council structure and/or operations, or discontinuance of the council.
- 7.7.b Following the initial review, the University council and its operations shall be reviewed in conjunction with the periodic review of the *Plan*.

ARTICLE 8 UNIVERSITY COUNCIL SPECIFICATIONS

8.1 **University Library Council**

- 8.1.a **Charge:** The University Library Council has the responsibility to provide advice and to report on policy issues concerning the University Libraries to the University Senate, to the Senior Vice President and Provost, and to the Dean of Libraries. (See Appendix 2 for additional responsibilities and the Council's Bylaws).
- 8.1.b **Membership:** The Council shall consist of thirteen (13) appointed members and three (3) ex officio members. The appointed members shall be: the Chair, ten (10) other faculty members including at least one (1) member of the library faculty, a graduate student, and an undergraduate student. The three (3) ex officio members shall be a representative of the office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, a representative of the Office of the Dean of Libraries, and the Chair-Elect of the Senate.
- 8.1.c The Chair shall be a tenured faculty member.
- 8.1.d **Reporting Responsibilities:** The University Library Council shall report to the University Senate and the Senior Vice President and Provost under the terms of responsibility defined in Article 7.4 of these *Bylaws*.

8.2 **University Research Council:**

Amended December 5, 2012

- 8.2.a Charge: In addition to the charges specified in Articles 5.2 and 7.4 of these *Bylaws*, the Council shall be governed by the following: The Council is charged to formulate and continually review policies regarding research, its funding, its relation to graduate and undergraduate academic degree programs, and its service to the community. Also, the Council is charged to review the research needs of faculty, other researchers and students, and to make recommendations to facilitate the research process and productivity of the University. Further, the Council shall formulate and continually review policies on the establishment, naming, reorganization, or abolition of bureaus, centers, or institutes that do not offer programs of instruction or regularly offer courses for credit, including their relationship to graduate and undergraduate academic programs. Additionally, when it perceives problems, the Council has the power to undertake investigative studies and recommend solutions.
- 8.2.b Membership: The University Research Council shall consist of thirteen (13) appointed members and ten (10) ex officio members. The appointed members shall be the Chair and eight (8) other faculty members; one (1) staff member; and three (3) students, including at least one (1) graduate and one (1) undergraduate student. The ten (10) ex officio members shall be a representative of the President (non-voting), a representative of the Senior Vice President and Provost (non-voting), a representative of the Vice President for Research, a representative of the Dean of the Graduate School, a representative of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Director of the Office of Research Administration and Advancement, and the Chairs of four (4) subcommittees of the University Research Council as follows: Research Development and Infrastructure Enhancement Subcommittee (RDIES); Research Advancement and Administration Subcommittee (TAAS); Intellectual Property and Economic Development Subcommittee (IPEDS); and Awards and Publicity Subcommittee (APS). The Chair shall be a tenured faculty member.
- 8.2.c Reporting Responsibilities: The University Research Council shall report to the University Senate and the Vice President for Research under the terms of responsibility defined in Article 7.4 of these *Bylaws* and the report establishing the University Research Council.

ARTICLE 9 DUTIES OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND DIRECTOR

- 9.1 The Executive Secretary and Director of the Senate shall be responsible for the minutes and audio recordings of all Senate meetings.
- 9.1.a The minutes shall include only actions and business transacted. They shall be submitted to the Senate for approval. Copies of the approved minutes shall be sent to all chief administrative officers of colleges, schools, departments, and other units, and to the campus news media.
- 9.1.b A complete audio recording shall be made of each meeting. An indexed copy of each audio recording, excluding only those parts recorded during closed sessions, shall be placed with the minutes in the University Archives for open access.
- 9.2 The Executive Secretary and Director shall also maintain the following kinds of Senate records (see Article 4.8):
- (1) All material distributed to Senate members;
 - (2) All material received by or distributed to members of the Executive Committee;
 - (3) Any minutes of the Senate or the Executive Committee not otherwise included under (1) and (2);
 - (4) Annual reports of all committees of the Senate not otherwise included under (1) and (2);
 - (5) The audio records of Senate meetings;
 - (6) The current and all previous versions of the *Plan* and the *Bylaws*;

- (7) Articles concerned with Senate structure and operation from campus and University publications as they come to the attention of the Executive Secretary and Director; and
 - (8) Other items deemed appropriate by the Executive Secretary and Director or the Chair of the Senate.
- 9.3 The Executive Secretary and Director shall store inactive records of the Senate in the University Archives.
 - 9.4 The Executive Secretary and Director shall be responsible for the preparation of the Senate budget in accordance with Article 4.6.
 - 9.5 The Executive Secretary and Director shall prepare as soon as possible after each annual senatorial election, a directory of the membership of the new Senate indicating for each member the constituency, term, office, local address, and telephone number. A copy of this directory shall be distributed to all members of the new Senate.
 - 9.6 The Executive Secretary and Director shall furnish all available information concerning the membership of the appropriate categories to each staff candidate nominated for election to the Senate.
 - 9.7 The Executive Secretary and Director shall keep a list, with campus addresses and telephone numbers, of all Senate officers and of all presiding officers of all Senate committees. This information shall be available upon request to any member of the campus community.
 - 9.8 The Executive Secretary and Director shall send to each Senator, by campus or electronic mail, a copy of the agenda and supporting material for each meeting. The receipt of the agenda and the supporting material then available shall satisfy the notice requirements of the meeting in question (Article 3.1 and 3.2.b).
 - 9.9 The Executive Secretary and Director shall prepare for the members of the Senate and its Executive Committee, as appropriate, all agendas, minutes, reports, and other documents, with the exception of proposals relating to the Programs, Curricula, and Courses (PCC) Committee. Nonetheless, the Executive Secretary and Director shall be responsible for the distribution of all items of Senate business, including PCC items to the members of the Senate and its Executive Committee, and to other such committees as necessary.
 - 9.10 The Executive Secretary and Director shall inform the Executive Committee of the status of all members of the Senate in accordance with the *Plan* (Article 3.4.a(4-5), 3.4.b(4-5), and 3.7) and these *Bylaws* (Articles 2.2, 4.1, 5.5, and 5.6).
 - 9.11 The Executive Secretary and Director shall have the privilege of attending the meetings of all standing committees and ad hoc committees of the Senate to assist in the coordination of Senate business.
 - 9.12 The Executive Secretary and Director, as the Senate's representative, shall provide information or assistance as requested to the committee for revision of the undergraduate catalog.

ARTICLE 10 ANNUAL TRANSITION OF THE SENATE

10.1 **Preparation for Transition:**

- 10.1.a By no later than the scheduled December meeting of the Senate, the Committee on Committees shall present to the Senate at least eight (8) nominees from among outgoing Senate members to serve on the Nominations Committee. The nominees shall include four (4) faculty members, one (1) exempt staff member, one (1) non-exempt staff member, one (1) graduate student, and one (1) undergraduate student. Further nominations shall be accepted from the floor of the Senate. The Senate, as a body, shall elect four (4) faculty members, one (1) exempt staff member, one (1) non-

exempt staff member, one (1) graduate student, and one (1) undergraduate to serve as the Nominations Committee. The Chair-elect of the Senate shall serve as a non-voting, ex officio member of the Nominations Committee. The Nominations Committee shall elect its own Chair. The Nominations Committee shall solicit nominations from the membership of the Senate and shall present to the Chair of the Senate by April 1:

- (1) A slate of at least two (2) candidates per seat from each constituency for elected membership on the Executive Committee, including those incumbent elected members who are eligible and willing to stand for reelection,
- (2) Slates of candidates to replace the outgoing members of the Committee on Committees and such other committees as required by these *Bylaws*, including at least one (1) nominee for each position to be filled, and
- (3) A minimum of two (2) candidates for the office of Chair-Elect.

Before reporting to the Chair of the Senate, the nominating committee shall secure the consent of all nominees in writing.

- 10.1.b. A brief statement of each candidate's qualifications shall be sent to the voting membership of the incoming Senate a minimum of twenty (20) calendar days before the Transitional Meeting of the Senate. Any further nominations made by members of the Senate and accompanied by a brief supporting statement and the consent of the candidate must be received by the Executive Secretary and Director at least twelve (12) working days before the Transitional Meeting. These additional nominations shall be mailed to the membership of the incoming Senate at least ten (10) working days before the Transitional Meeting.

10.2 **Transitional Meeting:**

- 10.2.a The Transitional Meeting will be the last regularly scheduled meeting of the Spring semester, and starts a new Senate session.
- 10.2.b Terms of office of newly elected Senators will begin, and the terms of the outgoing Senators will end, with the call to order of the transitional meeting by the outgoing Chair.
- 10.2.c Election of the Chair-Elect, as provided for in section 5.5.a of the *Plan*, shall be the first order of business of the Transitional Meeting, after which the outgoing Chair will pass the gavel to the previous Chair-Elect, who will assume the Chair.
- 10.2.d The election of the Executive Committee and the election of incoming members of the Committee on Committees, and such other persons elected by the members of the Senate as prescribed in these *Bylaws*, shall be scheduled special orders of the Transitional Meeting. Nominations may be received from the floor by the Chair, in addition to those provided for in Article 10.1. Any such nomination is contingent on the consent of the candidate, which must have been secured beforehand in writing if the nomination is made in the absence of the candidate. In the event of a tie vote in the election for members of the Executive Committee or the Committee on Committees, a ballot will be mailed to each Senator in the appropriate constituency. Ballots are to be returned to the Senate Office within one (1) week from the date mailed.
- 10.2.e The elected members of the outgoing Executive Committee and the Committee on Committees shall continue to serve until the election of new members is held.
- 10.2.f After the conclusion of the Transitional Meeting, any remaining vacancies on standing committees will be filled on an acting basis by the new Committee on Committees, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee and pending confirmation by the full Senate at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

APPENDIX 1

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS AND TERMS

Implementation Procedures

In the initial year [1994-95] of implementation of Section 5.5, the following provisions shall govern appointment of members eligible for appointment to two-year terms:

- (1) Half of the members shall be appointed to the committee for a one-year term and half for a two-year term.
- (2) When multiple members are selected for a committee from a particular constituency, half shall be appointed for one-year terms and half for two-year terms.
- (3) Incumbent committee members may be re-appointed to their committees for a one-year term, as long as their serving the one-year term does not extend their service beyond the length of service specified in Sections 5.5.e and 5.5.f.
- (4) In preparing their slate for Senate action, the Committee on Committees shall identify one-year nominees and two-year nominees. The Senate may change the length of term of any nominee as long as such changes do not violate provisions of the *Plan* and *Bylaws*.

APPENDIX 2 BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COUNCIL

1. **Charge to the Council:** The University Library Council has the responsibility to provide advice about policy issues concerning the University Libraries to the University Senate, to the Senior Vice President and Provost, and to the Dean of Libraries.

A. The Council's Responsibilities to the University Senate:

- (1) Make recommendations for major changes and improvements in policies, operations, and services of the Libraries that represent the concerns and interests of Senate constituencies as well as other users of the Libraries. Such recommendations should specify the resource implications. Reports and recommendations to the University Senate shall be submitted to the Senate Executive Committee for placement on the agenda of the University Senate in the same manner as reports from the Senate's general committees. It is expected that the Council will also inform the Senior Vice President and Provost in advance of these legislative recommendations. In addition to the mandatory annual report, the Chair of the Council shall keep the Chair of the Senate informed of the major issues before the Council and shall indicate when action or information items are likely to be forwarded for Senate consideration.
- (2) Respond to charges sent to the Council by the Senate Executive Committee.
- (3) Provide an annual written report of the Council's activities, including the status of recommendations made by the Council each year, and of unresolved issues before the Council.

B. The Council's Responsibilities to the Senior Vice President and Provost:

- (1) Advise on the Libraries' budget, space, personnel and staffing, and other resources. It is expected that the Senior Vice President and Provost will consult the Council before undertaking major reviews of the Libraries with APAC and before preparing the annual budget for the Libraries.
- (2) Advise on the Libraries' administrative policies and practices.
- (3) Advise on the charges to be given to the committees to review the Dean of Libraries and to conduct the unit review of the University Libraries based on University policy
- (4) Advise on matters concerning the Libraries in conjunction with accreditation review and strategic planning.
- (5) Respond to requests for review, analysis, and advice made by the Senior Vice President and Provost.

- (6) Meet at least annually with the Senior Vice President and Provost to review the major issues facing the Libraries and its activities on campus.
- (7) The Council is responsible for informing the Senior Vice President and Provost of pending reports and recommendations to the University Senate.

C. The Council's Responsibilities to the Dean of Libraries:

- (1) Advise on the needs and concerns of diverse constituencies within the campus community with respect to Library policies, services, and new resources and technology.
- (2) Advise on strategies to involve Library users in the initiation, evaluation, and integration of new Library policies, practices, procedures, and technology. Such strategies might include forums for the discussion of changes, workshops for adjusting to new technologies, and ongoing programs of Library education.
- (3) Advise on operations, policies and new opportunities.
- (4) Advise on Library planning including strategic planning and other major plans for Library operation and development.
- (5) Review and advise on the Libraries' reports, studies, and proposed initiatives that have significant long-term resource implications for the Libraries.
- (6) Hold at least one (1) meeting each year at which the Dean shall review major issues and plans, summarized in a State of the Libraries report distributed in advance to the Council.
- (7) It is expected that the Council will adopt a broad campus perspective and that the Dean of the Libraries will inform the Council of the University Libraries' needs and concerns and seek advice about major modifications of policies and operations affecting the campus community.

D. To Fulfill Its Responsibilities, the Council May:

- (1) Undertake investigative studies in matters concerning the University Libraries and recommend solutions to the University Senate, the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Dean of Libraries, or the general campus community.
- (2) Conduct open hearings on major issues concerning the University Libraries and their activities.
- (3) Communicate directly with the campus community on concerns related to support for, policies of, and services provided by the University Libraries.

2. **Composition of the Council:** The Council shall consist of thirteen (13) appointed members and three (3) ex officio members. The appointed members shall be: the Chair, ten (10) other faculty members including at least one (1) member of the Library faculty, a graduate student, and an undergraduate student. The three (3) ex officio members shall be a representative of the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, a representative of the Dean of the Libraries Office, and the Chair-Elect of the Senate.

A. Tenure in Office:

- (1) The Council Chair should be a tenured faculty member appointed for a single three-year term. Normally, the Chair shall have served as a member of the Council. If the Chair is serving as a regular member of the Council at the time of appointment, a new member shall be appointed to serve the remainder of the term the Chair has vacated. The Senior Vice President and Provost and the Senate Executive Committee shall reach an agreement on the Council Chair, and the joint choice shall be submitted to the University Senate for its approval.
- (2) The remaining ten (10) faculty members shall be appointed for staggered two-year terms. No faculty member shall serve more than two (2) terms consecutively. For this purpose, members who have served more than a year should be considered to have served a full term.

- (3) The two (2) student members shall be appointed for one-year terms. No student member should serve more than two (2) terms consecutively. For this purpose, student members who have served more than half their term should be considered to have served a full term.
- (4) The Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost will appoint a member of the Provost's staff as an ex officio member of the Council who will have voice but not vote.
- (5) The Dean of Libraries' Office will appoint an upper-level member of the Libraries' administrative staff as an ex officio member of the Council who will have voice but no vote.
- (6) The Chair-Elect of the Senate shall serve as an ex officio member of the Council who will have voice but no vote.

B. Qualifications of Council Members: Successful operation of the Council requires that the members of the Council understand the nature of the Libraries and represent the best interests of the campus as well as the particular interests of their specific constituencies.

1. The Council members should be chosen from people who can bring a campus-wide perspective to their deliberations on Library matters and who have shown interest and willingness to foster a good working relationship between the Libraries and their users.
2. Council members should be selected to represent as broad a range of campus disciplines and interests as possible. Faculty members should include representatives from both the professional and arts and sciences colleges, and within these constituencies, representatives of the arts and humanities, social sciences, and physical and biological sciences.

C. The Appointment Process: In the spring of each year, the Chair of the University Library Council shall notify the representative of the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Chair-Elect of the Senate of the appointments required for the following academic year. The representative of the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Chair-Elect of the Senate shall draw up a slate of committee members who will agree to serve, and the slate will be submitted to the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Committee on Committees for approval. The list of nominees for Council membership shall be submitted to the University Senate for approval. Ordinarily, the slate will be presented at the same Senate meeting at which other committee slates are approved. Dates of appointment and beginning of terms shall correspond with those of Senate committees. Replacement of Council members will take place through the same consultative process as the initial appointment, with submission of names to the Senate occurring as needed.

3. Operation of the Council: Effective and efficient Council operation will require adequate support and full cooperation among the Senate, the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Dean, and their offices.

- A. The University Senate Office or its designee will provide normal committee support to the Council, including maintaining mailing lists, reproducing Council documents, keeping a copy of Council minutes, maintaining files for the Council, and arranging meeting rooms.
- B. The Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, through its ex officio Council member, will provide liaison to other administrative units, such as the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment, for their reports, data, or assistance. The Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost will also provide website space for the Council.
- C. The Dean of the Libraries will provide the Council with internal data, reports, studies, etc. as needed to support the Council's work. The Dean will also arrange for unit staff to present testimony concerning such reports as the Council finds useful in carrying out its responsibilities. The Dean's assistance to the committee shall also include providing the Council members with the opportunity to attend an appropriate orientation session dealing with the Libraries.
- D. Control of the Council's agenda will be the responsibility of the Council Chair and the voting members of the Council.
- E. While being responsive to the needs of the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Senate in a timely manner is

necessary, the sponsoring parties and the Dean of the Libraries must not attempt to micro-manage the ongoing operation of the Council. In turn the Council must not attempt to micro manage the Libraries.

- F. The Council shall meet as necessary, but in no case less than once per semester. Meetings may be called by the Chair. In addition, upon receiving a request of any three members of the Council, the Chair shall call a meeting. A majority of the voting members of the Council shall constitute a quorum for the conducting of official business of the Council.

4. Operational Relationship of the Council to its Sponsors:

- A. For purposes of University Senate action, a Council created through Senate action will appear in essentially the same role as a general committee of the University Senate.
- B. The Chair may present reports and recommendations to the Senate but will not have a vote in Senate proceedings, unless he or she is a member of the Senate.
- C. Since the committees of the Senior Vice President and Provost range widely in form and function, and do not operate under a formal plan of organization and bylaws, there is no need to specify the Council's standing in the same fashion. For other purposes, such as APAC review of the Unit, the Council might be consulted like a College Advisory Council (that colleges will have under the shared governance plan) could be.
- D. The Dean of Libraries will ordinarily meet with the Council and have a voice in its deliberations. Since one of the three main functions of the Council is to advise the Dean, the Dean shall not formally be a member of the Council. On formal reports and recommendations of the Council to the University Senate or to the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Dean of the Libraries may send a separate memorandum to the Senate or the Senior Vice President and Provost, as appropriate, supporting or opposing the report or the recommendations, and providing the rationale for the Dean's position.
5. **Review of the Council:** The Council and its operations will be reviewed in conjunction with the periodic review of the Senate and the *Plan*.

**APPENDIX 3
PROCEDURES FOR ELECTIONS OF UMCP REPRESENTATIVES TO THE
COUNCIL OF UNIVERSITY SYSTEM FACULTY (CUSF)**

The Chair of CUSF is not a member of CUSF. Thus, if the Chair is from College Park, a replacement must be named. At the end of his/her term as Chair, if his/her term on CUSF is not finished, he/she resumes his/her position as a CUSF member.

The normal term for CUSF representatives is three (3) years, with two alternates serving three (3) – year terms; if both alternates are elected at the same time, priority to be a replacement shall be in order of votes received; if a regular representative is unable to serve out his/her term, an alternate replaces him/her for the remainder of the term, and a new alternate is named. The replacement representative shall be chosen in order of number of votes received. The Nominations Committee will select a replacement alternate subject to confirmation by the Senate.

The University Senate, in accordance with its usual procedures, will elect representatives to CUSF in the spring. Faculty members only are entitled to vote. Each faculty Senate member has as many votes as there are open positions. If there are more candidates than positions, the person(s) receiving the most votes, in order, are declared representatives. The person receiving the next most votes is declared alternate. The remaining person, in order of vote tally, will be asked to move into the alternate position if the previous paragraph comes in to play. A record of the outcome of the election will be retained by the Executive Secretary and Director of the University Senate. If there are not sufficient candidates, or the pool of candidates is exhausted, representatives are chosen by the Executive Committee.

Dates of Approval, Updates and Amendments to the Senate Bylaws

(Approved, Campus Senate, October 9, 1986)
 (Approved, Board of Regents, February 6, 1987)
 (Updated, July 1, 1988)
 (Amended, February 13, 1986)
 (Amended, December 7, 1986)
 (Amended, May 7, 1990)
 (Amended, September 13, 1990)
 (Amended, November 15, 1990)
 (Amended, October 14, 1993)
 (Amended, December 6, 1993)
 (Amended, March 31, 1994)
 (Amended, April 18, 1994)
 (Amended, May 5, 1994)
 (Amended, November 10, 1994)
 (Amended, August 28, 1996)
 (Amended, May 15, 1997)
 (Amended, March 5, 1998)
 (Amended, April 2, 1998)
 (Amended, April 6, 2000)

(Amended, February 12, 2001)
 (Amended, September 19, 2002)
 (Amended, February 3, 2003)
 (Amended, October 16, 2003)
 (Amended, April 19, 2004)
 (Amended, April 4, 2005)
 (Amended, May 15, 2007)
 (Amended, May 8, 2008)
 (Amended, October 16, 2008)
 (Amended, February 9, 2009)
 (Amended, May 4, 2009)
 (Amended, November 12, 2009)
 (Amended, March 3, 2010)
 (Amended, February 9, 2011)
 (Amended, May 4, 2011)
 (Amended, March 8, 2012)
 (Amended April 19, 2012)
 (Amended December 5, 2012)

APPENDIX 2 - SENATE DOCUMENT NUMBER 09-10-41: REVIEW OF QUORUM CALCULATION IN SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES



**University Senate
TRANSMITTAL FORM**

Senate Document #:	09-10-41																				
PCC ID #:	NA																				
Title:	Review of Quorum Calculation in Senate Standing Committees																				
Presenter:	Marc Pound, Chair of Elections, Representation & Governance Committee (ERG)																				
Date of SEC Review:	January 28, 2011																				
Date of Senate Review:	February 9, 2011																				
Voting (highlight one):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report 																				
Statement of Issue:	Several of the Standing Senate Committees are large and find it difficult to conduct business at Committee meetings due to a lack of quorum and might benefit from an alternate quorum calculation procedure.																				
Relevant Policy # & URL:	NA																				
Recommendation:	<p>The ERG Committee recommends tailored quorums for committees that have 16 or more voting members, subtracting 1, 2, or 3 from the current quorum depending on the committee size, to create what would be an "optimally successful" number. No committee can reach quorum solely with Ex-Officio members.</p> <p>The ERG recommends revised quorums for the following committees:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Committee</th> <th style="text-align: right;">Quorum</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>-----</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Academic Procedures and Standards</td> <td style="text-align: right;">9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Campus Affairs</td> <td style="text-align: right;">9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CORE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Educational Affairs</td> <td style="text-align: right;">11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Equity, Diversity & Inclusion</td> <td style="text-align: right;">11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ERG</td> <td style="text-align: right;">8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Faculty Affairs</td> <td style="text-align: right;">8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Programs, Curricula and Courses</td> <td style="text-align: right;">9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Committee	Quorum	-----		Academic Procedures and Standards	9	Campus Affairs	9	CORE	8	Educational Affairs	11	Equity, Diversity & Inclusion	11	ERG	8	Faculty Affairs	8	Programs, Curricula and Courses	9
Committee	Quorum																				

Academic Procedures and Standards	9																				
Campus Affairs	9																				
CORE	8																				
Educational Affairs	11																				
Equity, Diversity & Inclusion	11																				
ERG	8																				
Faculty Affairs	8																				
Programs, Curricula and Courses	9																				

	<p>Staff Affairs 12</p> <p>Student Affairs 12</p>
<p>Committee Work:</p>	<p>In the Fall of 2010 the ERG Committee discovered that every committee failed to meet quorum requirements at least once during the 2009-2010 academic year. Current quorum procedure for Standing Committees follows Robert’s Rules; a quorum is 50% of the total number of members plus one. The committee decided that the fundamental issue is that many committees are failing to meet quorum for meetings, especially those committees with larger numbers.</p> <p>At the October 6, 2010 meeting the Committee recounted past attempts to revise the quorum requirements for committees that had failed to be adopted. The ERG Committee concluded that there are two possible solutions to the lack of quorum for the Standing Committees: either lower the quorum for the Standing Committees or allow for business to be conducted without a quorum present. Lowering the quorum in the Standing Committees was deemed the more favorable solution. Several methods of lowering the quorums for Standing Committees were discussed and later analyzed.</p> <p>The analysis presented at the November 3, 2010 meeting revealed that, if the quorum were dropped to 1/3 of the members, some Senate Committees could conduct business with very few members present. Furthermore, a few committees could constitute a quorum composed entirely of Ex-Officio members. It was agreed that while it may not be preferable to have a majority of Ex-Officio members deciding a committee vote, the final decision is made in the full Senate where all campus constituencies have representation.</p> <p>The ERG Committee also discussed whether it was appropriate for excused absences to be allowed on Standing Committees much like is done for the Senate. They also considered the method of quorum calculation for Senate meetings (Senate Bylaws 3.4.b), applied only on the Standing Committees of a certain size; the smaller committees would continue with the current practice. Neither of these solutions was deemed satisfactory. The conclusion was that there is no “one-size-fits-all” solution.</p> <p>After the November meeting the ERG Committee voted via email to approve recommending tailoring the quorums for Standing</p>

	Committees with 16 or more voting members.
Alternatives:	Senate Standing Committees could continue having difficulty meeting quorum, impairing their ability to move Senate business forward.
Risks:	There are no associated risks.
Financial Implications:	There are no financial implications.
Further Approvals Required: <i>(*Important for PCC Items)</i>	Senate approval, Presidential approval

**Senate Elections, Representation, and Governance (ERG) Committee
Report on Review of Quorum Calculation in Senate Standing Committees
November 2010**

Statement of the Problem

Several Senate Standing Committees have had difficulty meeting quorum on multiple occasions, impairing their ability to move Senate business forward.

Background

On April 22, 2010 the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the ERG committee to review the current procedures for quorum calculation in the Senate Standing Committees. The ERG Committee began discussing the charge and the background information presented in the charge at the May 10, 2010 meeting (which notably did not have quorum!). It was decided that additional research was needed for full consideration of this issue, for instance, which Committees struggled to reach a quorum during the 2009-2010 academic year. (Appendix 2)

Committee Work

In the Fall of 2010, the ERG Committee continued research and discussion of the charge and possible recommendations. It was discovered that every committee failed to meet quorum requirements at least once during the 2009-2010 academic year. The fundamental issue is that many committees are failing to meet quorum for meetings, especially those committees with larger membership populations. Research also recounted past attempts to revise the quorum requirements for committees that had failed to be adopted. (Appendix 3)

Current quorum procedure for Standing Committees follows Robert's Rules; a quorum is 50% of the total number of members plus one. (Appendix 4) There are two possible solutions to the lack of quorum for the Standing Committees: either lower the quorum for the Standing Committees or allow for business to be conducted without a quorum present. The latter was recognized as an unfavorable option. Though there are practical ways to work around the quorum requirement, such as conducting business by email or creatively scheduling meetings, these may ameliorate, but do not directly address, the problem. Lowering the quorum in the Standing Committees is the only way to combat the problem procedurally.

Several methods of lowering the quorums for Standing Committees were discussed and analyzed. If 1/3 of the members constituted a quorum, the number of committee members deciding on business in certain Standing Committees could be very small. (Appendix 5) Reducing the size of all Standing Committees would also be difficult to accomplish because all constituencies need to be fairly represented. Another difficulty in reducing the size of the Standing Committees is the number of appointed Ex-Officio members, especially on the larger committees.

The analysis revealed that, if the quorum were dropped to 1/3 of the members, some Senate Committees could constitute a quorum composed entirely of Ex-Officio members. ERG Committee members were concerned that this may not be truly representative because Ex-Officio committee members serve based on their departmental position, not through a

representative selection process. (Appendix 6) On the other hand, while it may not be preferable to have a majority of Ex-Officio members deciding a committee vote, the final decision is made in the full Senate (assuming it is put on the agenda by the SEC) where all campus constituencies have representation.

The ERG Committee also discussed whether it was appropriate for excused absences to be allowed on Standing Committees much like is done for the Senate. They also considered the method of quorum calculation for Senate meetings (Senate Bylaws 3.4.b which states a quorum for meetings would be defined as a majority of elected Senators that have not received prior approval for absence from the Senate Office, or fifty (50) Senators, whichever number is higher.) This would be applied only on the Standing Committees of a certain size; the smaller committees would continue with the current practice. Neither of these solutions was deemed satisfactory.

The conclusion is that there is no “one-size-fits-all” solution.

Recommendation

The ERG Committee agreed that there should be a benchmark number below which committee business could not be conducted, no matter the size of the committee. It was decided that trying to compose one universal method to determine quorum that works for every committee might not be reasonable. It instead may better serve the Standing Committees to specify a numerical quorum for each committee in the Bylaws rather than the current practice of Robert’s Rules. (Appendix 7) Therefore, the ERG Committee tailored proposed quorums for committees that had 16 or more voting members, subtracting 1, 2, or 3 from the current quorum depending on the committee size, to create what would be an "optimally successful" number. No committee can reach quorum solely with Ex-Officio members.

The ERG recommends revised quorums for the following committees:

Committee	Quorum

Academic Procedures and Standards	9
Campus Affairs	9
CORE	8
Educational Affairs	11
Equity, Diversity & Inclusion	11
ERG	8
Faculty Affairs	8
Programs, Curricula and Courses	9
Staff Affairs	12
Student Affairs	12

The Senate Bylaws should be amended to define the specified for quorums for these committees.

Appendix 1 –Charge

Appendix 2 -Failed Quorum

Appendix 3 -Quorum Research

Appendix 4-Robert's Rules

Appendix 5 -Quorum Calculation 1/3 Chart

Appendix 6 -Quorum Calculation Information (D. Ellis)

Appendix 7 -Proposed Quorum Calculation Chart

Appendix 1



**University Senate
CHARGE**

Date:	April 22, 2010
To:	Kendra Wells Chair, Elections, Representation & Governance Committee
From:	Elise Miller-Hooks Chair, University Senate
Subject:	Review of Quorum Calculation in Senate Standing Committees
Senate Document #:	09-10-41
Deadline:	December 1, 2010

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) requests that the Elections, Representation, and Governance (ERG) Committee review the attached proposal from the Staff Affairs Committee entitled, "Review of Quorum Calculation in Senate Standing Committees."

The SEC would like the ERG committee to review the current quorum calculation process and identify whether changes should be made to accommodate standing committees with a large membership. We also ask that you review past attempts at revising the process and the current process used for calculating a quorum at Senate meetings. The ERG Committee should advise on whether a specific guideline for quorum calculation of standing committees should be included in the Senate Bylaws. If the committee finds that a change is warranted, we ask that you propose an amendment to the Bylaws.

We ask that you submit your report and recommendations to the Senate Office no later than December 1, 2010. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.

Appendix 2

**Senate Committees that failed to reach quorum more than once in
2009-2010:**

Committee	# of members	quorum #	# of meetings without quorum According to Minutes
Campus Affairs	20	11	4
Faculty Affairs	18	10	2
Educational Affairs	26(2 non-voting)	13	2
ERG	16	9	2
Student Affairs	30	16	2
EDI	23	13	4
Staff Affairs	28	15	4



UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

COLLEGE PARK SENATE

ELECTIONS, REPRESENTATION AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

1997-1998

ANNUAL REPORT

WILLIAM B. WALTERS, CHAIR

During the 1997-1998 academic year, the Elections, Representation and Governance (ERG) Committee examined and approved two college plans of organization—the College of Arts and Humanities and the Clark School of Engineering. Also, the committee examined and discussed the plans of organization from the Robert H. Smith School of Business and Management and the School of Public Affairs. These two plans were forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee with the points of non-compliance noted to the University of Maryland Plan of Organization and the College Park Senate Bylaws were not observed.

The following Senate Bylaw changes were considered, approved and sent to the floor of the Senate for action.

- a) *Article 3.1* (Senate Document #97-98-25z): The second sentence shall read "The notice, agenda, and supporting documents shall be mailed from the Senate Office to the membership no later than one calendar week prior to each regular meeting unless otherwise approved by the Executive Committee." This change reduced the lead time for sending out materials from 10 to about 5 working days. Passed by the Senate at its March 5, 1998 meeting.
- b) *Article 4.1.c* (Senate Document #97-98-26z): The first sentence shall read, "... special order at the transitional meeting of the Senate ...". This change substituted the words "transitional meeting of the Senate" for the words "first meeting of the Senate in the Spring Semester". Passed by the Senate at its March 5, 1998 meeting.
- c) *Article 4.7.b* (Senate Document #97-98-26z): The first sentence shall read, "The Executive Committee may also refer any item ...". This change inserted the word "may" in the phrase. Passed by the Senate at its March 5, 1998 meeting.
- d) *Article 5.6.e* (Senate Document #97-98-27z): The last line shall read "... the transitional meeting...". These changes replaced the word "organizing" with the word "transitional". Passed by the Senate at its March 5, 1998 meeting.

Article 5.6.g (Senate Document #97-98-27z): The last line shall read "... the transitional meeting...". These changes replaced the word "organizing" with the word "transitional". Passed by the Senate at its March 5, 1998 meeting.

Article 5.6.h (Senate Document #97-98-27z): The first sentence shall read "... at the transitional meeting ...". This change replaced the word "organizing" with the word "transitional". Passed by the Senate at its March 5, 1998 meeting.

- e) *Article 6.4.a* (Senate Document #97-98-28z): The first, third, and fifth lines shall read "one faculty representative" instead of "one representative". This change clarified that these committee members are to be members of the faculty. Passed by the Senate at its March 5, 1998 meeting.

Article 6.4.a (Senate Document #97-98-28z): The designation for the former "College of Agriculture" shall be replaced by its new name, "College of Agriculture and Natural Resources". Passed by the Senate at its March 5, 1998 meeting.

- f) *Article 10.1.a(2)* (Senate Document #97-98-29z): This statement would read "... including at least one nominee for each position to be filled, and ..." This change eliminated the requirement that the Nominating Committee present a slate to the Senate that includes two nominees for each position to be filled. Passed by the Senate at its March 5, 1998 meeting.

- g) *Article 6.5.a* (Senate Document #97-98-28z): The section shall read "Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; ten faculty members; two undergraduate students and one graduate student; and the following persons or a representative of each: The Vice president for Academic Affairs/Provost, the Director of Honors, and the Administrative Deans of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies. The presiding officers of the Program, Curricula and Courses (PCC) and the CORE Liberal Arts and Sciences (CORE) Committees shall be non-voting ex-officio members." This change eliminated the phrase "presiding members of the associated adjunct committees" as there are no associated adjunct committees, and shifted the status of the presiding officers of the Program, Curricula and Courses and the CORE Liberal Arts and Sciences Committees to non-voting and ex-officio members. These presiding officers remain members of the committee and in a position to receive all mailings and minutes of the committee and may attend as required or desired, but do not play a role in the quorum count. Passed by the Senate at its March 5, 1998 meeting.

- h) *Article 6.7.a* (Senate Document #97-98-28z): The section shall read, "Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; 10 faculty members of whom 4 shall be senators and 2 must be untenured; one ... This change reduced the number of faculty members from 15 to 10, the number that must be senators from 8 to 4, and the number that must be non-tenured from 5 to 2. Passed by the Senate at its March 5, 1998 meeting.

- i) *Article 5.3.c Rules for Procedure of Standing Committees:* (Senate Document #97-98-31z)

5.3.c (1) The version of Robert's Rules of Order that shall govern the conduct of Standing Committees shall be Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised. Passed by the Senate at its April 2, 1998 meeting.

5.3.c (2) A quorum for meetings of Standing committees shall be one third of the voting members of the committee. Business transacted by a Standing Committee in the absence of a quorum must be specified as such in any report on committee activities. Presented on the Senate floor at its April 2, 1998 meeting, but failed.

An alternate motion for Article 5.3.c (2) was later proposed by the committee but not acted upon.

5.3.c Rules for Procedure of Standing Committees:

5.3.c (2) A quorum for meetings of Standing Committees shall be 1/3 of the voting members for committees with 18 or more members; for committees with fewer than 18 voting members, the smaller of 6 of the voting members or 50% of the voting members must be present. Business transacted by a Standing Committee in the absence of a quorum must be specified as such in any report on committee activities.

The issue of quorum number is still alive and still needs to be addressed.

The committee also discussed the issue of the size of the Student Affairs Committee. Again, it is a large committee and the issue remains of concern.

***ELECTIONS, REPRESENTATION AND GOVERNANCE
1997-98 COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP***

William Walters, Chair
Matthew Bodoff
John Van Brunt
Robert Gaines
Paul Green

Patricia Greenspan
Robert Merikangas
Sabastian Niles
Marvin Pyles
Scott Rankin
Janet Schmidt

Ex Officio

Dawn Leavell
Marty Vitale



University Senate

Senate Doc #

Date Received

Date of Item

Document Name

Requestor

Status 05-06-2003 Senate Chair-Elect Cohen proposed a change in the rule governing quorum at meetings of the SEC. On a number of occasions in the past year the SEC could not vote on business items because it lacked the presence of seven voting members, as required in the Senate Bylaws. Senate Chair Cartwright agreed to charge the ERG Committee with deciding whether a change in the current procedural rule is appropriate and to consider the proposed amendment to the Bylaws or develop language of its own. The charge was sent it to David Sumner on 5/7/03. The ERG Committee questioned the need to change the quorum rule because the committee had a different understanding of how to count members. Cohen subsequently decided that the quorum rule does not need to be changed. The ERG report of December 12 came to the SEC for information purposes. The ERG Committee's interpretation of quorum count is different from the SEC's practice in recent years. It included the Senate Chair as a voting member for the purposes of a quorum. The SEC agreed with this outcome at its 12/12/03 meeting.

The charge was formally withdrawn, but the ERG Committee's information report was accepted at the 12/12/03 SEC meeting.

Pending EC? Yes No Pending Senate? Yes No PCC Number

1st Standing Assign ERG Committed 2nd Standing Assign

Senate Agenda Response of President Board of Regents

MHEC Filing Closed Yes No



UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

UNIVERSITY SENATE

1100 Marie Mount Hall
College Park, Maryland 20742-7541
301.405.5805 TEL 301.405.5749 FAX
<http://www.inform.umd.edu/CampusInfo/Senate>

December 12, 2003

MEMORANDUM

TO: Joel Cohen, Chair, University Senate

FROM: Alan Mattlage, Chair, Elections, Representation & Governance Committee ^{am}

SUBJECT: Proposal to Change the Rule Governing the Quorum for Meetings of the Senate Executive Committee, Senate Document Number 02-03-59

At two of our meetings, the Elections, Representation and Governance Committee discussed the proposal to change the rule governing the quorum for meetings of the Senate Executive Committee. The Committee reviewed Article 4.1.a of the Senate Bylaws and Article 8.2 of the Plan of Organization. These articles establish that the Executive Committee is to be composed of fourteen (14) voting members, including the Chair and Chair-Elect of the Senate. Article 4.5 of the Bylaws establishes that the quorum for the Executive Committee is to be seven (7) voting members. Consequently, the Chair and the Chair-Elect of the Senate may be counted for the purposes of a quorum.

The Election, Representation and Governance Committee believes that seven is an appropriate number for the Executive Committee quorum. Consequently, we recommend that no changes be made in the articles governing the Executive Committee quorum.

AM/MG/am

cc: Mary Giles, Executive Secretary and Director



UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

UNIVERSITY SENATE

1100 Marie Mount Hall
College Park, Maryland 20742-7541
301.405.5805 TEL 301.405.5749 FAX
<http://www.inform.umd.edu/CampusInfo/Senate>

May 7, 2003

MEMORANDUM

TO: David Sumner
Chair of the Senate Elections, Representation, and Governance Committee

FROM: Kent Cartwright *KE*
Professor of English and Chair of the University Senate

SUBJECT: Proposal to Change the Procedural Rule Governing Quorum
at Meetings of the Senate Executive Committee
(Senate Document Number 02-03-59)

Yesterday, Senate Chair-Elect Joel Cohen proposed a change in the rule governing quorum at meetings of the Senate Executive Committee. According to Article 4.5 of the Senate Bylaws, a quorum of the Executive Committee shall be seven voting members. This past year, the Executive Committee has from time to time been without the required seven at its biweekly meetings. The lack of a quorum has delayed action on important items of Senate business and the setting of the monthly Senate agendas. The Executive Committee seeks a remedy that conforms to the spirit and the letter of Senate rules.

Professor Cohen recommends adapting the procedural rule for quorum at Senate meetings to the needs of the Executive Committee. With Article 3.4 of the Bylaws as a model, Article 4.5 could be amended to read:

A quorum of the Executive Committee shall be defined as a majority of elected members who have not received prior approval for absence from the Office of the University Senate, or five (5) members, whichever number is higher. For the purposes of determining a quorum, the Senate Chair, the Executive Secretary, the Parliamentarian, and the representatives of the President and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs will not be considered.

The Executive Committee agrees to the general principle that Professor Cohen has enunciated. We ask that the Elections, Representation, and Governance Committee consider the implications of Professor Cohen's proposal. If you decide a change in the current procedural rule appropriate, please consider the proposed amendment or craft new language for this change to the Bylaws.

David Sumner
May 7, 2003

Page 2

Professor Cohen hopes to have this change approved by the Senate and in place early in the fall semester. Would you then review this matter before the present ERG Committee disbands? I look forward to your comments and your advice. If you have any questions, please contact Mary Giles on extension 5-5804.

KC:mdg

Cc: A. Montgomery

Information on Quorum From Robert's Rules

64. A Quorum of an assembly is such a number as must be present in order that business can be legally transacted. The quorum refers to the number present, not to the number voting. The quorum of a mass meeting is the number present at the time, as they constitute the membership at that time. The quorum of a body of delegates, unless the by-laws provide for a smaller quorum, is a majority of the number enrolled as attending the convention, not those appointed. The quorum of any other deliberative assembly with an enrolled membership (unless the by-laws provide for a smaller quorum) is a majority of all the members. In the case, however, of a society, like many religious ones, where there are no annual dues, and where membership is for life (unless it is transferred or the names are struck from the roll by a vote of the society) the register of members is not reliable as a list of the bona fide members of the society, and in many such societies it would be impossible to have present at a business meeting a majority of those enrolled as members. Where such societies have no by-law establishing a quorum, the quorum consists of those who attend the meeting, provided it is either a stated meeting or one that has been properly called.

In all ordinary societies the by-laws should provide for a quorum as large as can be depended upon for being present at all meetings when the weather is not exceptionally bad. In such an assembly the chairman should not take the chair until a quorum is present, or there is no prospect of there being a quorum. The only business that can be transacted in the absence of a quorum is to take measures to obtain a quorum, to fix the time to which to adjourn, and to adjourn, or to take a recess. Unanimous consent cannot be given when a quorum is not present, and a notice given then is not valid. In the case of an annual meeting, where certain business for the year, as the election of officers, must be attended to during the session, the meeting should fix a time for an adjourned meeting and then adjourn.

In an assembly that has the power to compel the attendance of its members, if a quorum is not present at the appointed hour, the chairman should wait a few minutes before taking the chair. In the absence of a quorum such an assembly may order a call of the house [\[41\]](#) and thus compel attendance of absentees, or it may adjourn, providing for an adjourned meeting if it pleases.

In committee of the whole the quorum is the same as in the assembly; if it finds itself without a quorum it can do nothing but rise and report to the assembly, which then adjourns. In any other committee the majority is a quorum, unless the assembly order otherwise, and it must wait for a quorum before proceeding to business. Boards of trustees, managers, directors, etc., are on the same footing as committees as regards a quorum. Their power is delegated to them as a body, and their quorum, or what number shall be present, in order that they may act as a board or committee, cannot be determined by them, unless so provided in the by-laws.

While no question can be decided in the absence of a quorum excepting those mentioned above, a member cannot be interrupted while speaking in order to make the point of no quorum. The debate may continue in the absence of a quorum until some one raises the point while no one is speaking.

While a quorum is competent to transact any business, it is usually not expedient to transact important business unless there is a fair attendance at the meeting, or else previous notice of such action has been given.

Care should be taken in amending the rule providing for a quorum. If the rule is struck out first, then the quorum instantly becomes a majority of all the members, so that in many societies it would be nearly impracticable to secure a quorum to adopt a new rule. The proper way is to amend by striking out certain words (or the whole rule) and inserting certain other words (or the new rule), which is made and voted on as one question.

NOTE ON QUORUM. -- After all the members of an organization have had reasonable notice of a meeting, and ample opportunity for discussion, if a majority of the total membership of the organization come to a certain decision, that must be accepted as the action or opinion of that body. But, with the exception of a body of delegates, it is seldom that a vote as great as a majority of the total membership of a large voluntary organization can be obtained for anything, and consequently there has been established a common parliamentary law principle, that if a bare majority of the membership is present at a meeting properly called or provided for, a majority vote (which means a majority of those who vote) shall be sufficient to make the act the act of the body, unless it suspends a rule or a right of a member (as the right to introduce questions and the right of free discussion before being required to vote on finally disposing of a question) and that a two-thirds vote shall have the power to suspend these rules and rights. This gives the right to act for the society to about one-fourth of its members in ordinary cases, and to about one-third of its members in case of suspending the rules and certain rights. But it has been found impracticable to accomplish the work of most voluntary societies if no business can be transacted unless a majority of the members is present. In large organizations, meeting weekly or monthly for one or two hours, it is the exception when a majority of the members is present at a meeting, and therefore it has been found necessary to require the presence of only a small percentage of the members to enable the assembly to act for the organization, or, in other words, to establish a small quorum. In legislative bodies in this country, which are composed of members paid for their services, it is determined by the constitutions to be a majority of their members. Congress in 1861 decided this to be a majority of the members chosen. In the English House of Commons it is 40 out of nearly 700, being about 6% of the members, while in the House of Lords the quorum is 3, or about one-half of 1% of the members. Where the quorum is so small it has been found necessary to require notice of all bills, amendments, etc., to be given in advance; and even in Congress, With its large quorum, one day's notice has to be given of any motion to rescind or change any rule or standing order. This principle is a sound one, particularly with societies meeting monthly or weekly for one or two hours, and with small quorums, where frequently the assembly is no adequate representation of the society. The difficulty in such cases may be met in societies adopting this Manual by the proper use of the motion to reconsider and have entered on the minutes as explained in [36:13](#).

Appendix 5

Committee Composition for Quorum Calculation (not including SEC)

Committee	Total Membership Mandated in Bvlaws	Voting Members	Regular (Includes Chair)	Ex Officio	Ex Officio - N.V.	Current Quorum	1/3 of Voting Members
Academic Procedures and Standards	20	20	16	4	0	11	7
Campus Affairs	20	20	13	7	0	11	7
Committee on Committees	11	11	10	1	0	7	4
CORE	16	16	13	3	0	9	6
Educational Affairs	26	24	18	6	2	13	8
Equity, Diversity & Inclusion	23	23	19	4	0	13	8
ERG	16	16	14	2	0	9	6
Faculty Affairs	17	17	14	3	0	10	6
Governmental Affairs	11	11	6	5	0	7	4
Programs, Curricula and Courses	18	18	14	4	0	10	6
Staff Affairs	29	29	18	11	0	16	10
Student Affairs	29	29	20	9	0	16	10
Student Conduct	11	10	10	0	1	6	4

notes:

In accordance with standard practice, all 1/3 calculations were rounded down to the nearest whole number

The chair of Committee on Committees is ex officio

Staff Affairs ex officio numbers may vary based on CUSS membership

Where the last number on the right is in red, ex officio members alone could constitute a quorum using the 1/3 rule

Quorum Calculation for Committees

Per the request of the Chair, I have compiled the following thoughts on using the Senate standard for calculating quorum in committees.

Relevant Citation from the Senate Bylaws:

3.4.b A quorum for meetings shall be defined as a majority of elected Senators who have not received prior approval for absence from the Office of the University Senate, or fifty (50) Senators, whichever number is higher. For the purpose of determining a quorum, ex officio members with or without vote shall not be considered.

Issues

Who's Counted for a Quorum?

- The Senate uses "elected Senators" *not* "voting members" for its calculation, which differs from the RONR standard.
- Using the "elected" standard in committees would be somewhat complicated since the ratio of elected to unelected members would vary from year to year (even throughout the year).
- Currently committees use the RONR standard, which is "voting members." As defined in RONR (10th ed.) pp. 466-67 and 480, 1. 18-27, this includes any ex officio members who are not specifically designated as "non-voting" with two exceptions: 1) a presiding officer (in this case the Chair of the Senate) who is automatically a member of all committees; 2) an ex officio who is not a regular member of the body (in this case someone appointed ex-officio who is not an employee of the University). Neither currently applies.

Does the Number of Ex Officio's Matter for Counting Quorum?

- In general an elected body should never be able to obtain a quorum with only unelected members – this probably constitutes the rationale for the choice of "elected members" in the Senate Bylaws.
- The Senate itself has a huge number of *non voting* ex officio members (All VP's chairs, directors, etc.) but only the 16 Deans are voting ex officio members. The balance is somewhat different in committees.

- As the attached spreadsheet shows, many committees have a large number of ex officio members. While what I am calling "regular members" may not necessarily be elected (myself for example), the same principle should probably be applied to them that is applied to elected Senators – in the sense that they have been deliberately selected through some process other than by virtue of holding a particular job title.
- This presents three issues for us to contemplate:
 1. Clearly we don't want to make it *harder* to obtain a quorum, which would certainly be the case if we stopped counting "voting members" and switched to counting only "regular members."
 2. However, if we switch to a 1/3 floor for quorum, there are four committees where it would be theoretically possible to obtain a quorum *with only ex officio members*. This is especially noteworthy since Staff Affairs and Student Affairs are two of the committees in question.
 3. *On the other hand* – if there are any committees with large numbers of ex officio members who rarely have time to attend (Staff Affairs and Student Affairs again suggest themselves, although I don't know about ex officio attendance records at either), eliminating them from the count might make quorum easier to reach.

How Many Is "Too Few" People for a Quorum?

- Officially there is no standard answer to this question, since quorum is based on a certain percentage of a body, and of course on a five member board it would be perfectly logical to have a quorum of three. However, in our meetings the idea has been casually discussed that there is a sort of absurdity threshold with a committee of 20 people having a vote of two to one on an issue, for example.
- To that end, you can see from the attached spreadsheet that there are three committees which would have a 3 person quorum under a 1/3 floor system: Student Conduct, the Committee on Committees, and Governmental Affairs.

Appendix 7

Committee Composition for Quorum Calculation (not including SEC)

Committee	Total Membership Mandated in Bylaws	Voting Members	Regular (Includes Chair)	Ex Officio	Ex Officio - N.V.	Current Quorum	Proposed Quorum
Academic Procedures and Stanc	20	20	16	4	0	11	9
Campus Affairs	20	20	13	7	0	11	9
Committee on Committees	11	11	10	1	0	6	6
CORE	16	16	13	3	0	9	8
Educational Affairs	26	24	18	6	2	13	11
Equity, Diversity & Inclusion	23	23	19	4	0	12	11
ERG	16	16	14	2	0	9	8
Faculty Affairs	17	17	14	3	0	9	8
Governmental Affairs	11	11	6	5	0	6	6
Programs, Curricula and Course	18	18	14	4	0	10	9
Staff Affairs	29	29	18	11	0	15	12
Student Affairs	29	29	20	9	0	15	12
Student Conduct	11	10	10	0	1	6	6

notes:

In accordance with standard practice, all 1/3 calculations were rounded down to the nearest whole number

The chair of Committee on Committees is ex officio

Staff Affairs ex officio numbers may vary based on CUSS membership

**APPENDIX 3 - UNIVERSITY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CHARGE
TO MODIFY THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE APAS COMMITTEE TO
INCLUDE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR**



**University Senate
CHARGE**

Date:	March 14, 2013
To:	Devin Ellis Chair, Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee
From:	Martha Nell Smith  Chair, University Senate
Subject:	Request to Modify the Membership of the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee to Include a Representative of the Office of the Registrar
Senate Document #:	12-13-47
Deadline:	April 11, 2013

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) requests that the Elections, Representation & Governance (ERG) Committee review the attached proposal entitled, "Request to Modify the Membership of the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee to Include a Representative of the Office of the Registrar," and evaluate whether the Office of the Registrar should be given representation on the APAS Committee.

Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Consider whether an ex-officio seat on the APAS Committee should be created for the Office of the Registrar.
2. Consider whether the Office of the Registrar should be given representation on other senate committees.
3. Consider whether any changes to membership should be voting or non-voting.
4. Consider whether adding an ex-officio member to the committee adversely affects the balance of regular members versus administrative representatives.
5. If appropriate, recommend changes to the Senate Bylaws.

We ask that you submit your report and recommendations to the Senate Office no later than April 11, 2013. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.



University Senate PROPOSAL FORM

Name:	Christopher C. Davis
Date:	March 1, 2013
Title of Proposal:	Request to Modify the Membership of the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee to Include a Representative of the Office of the Registrar
Phone Number:	301-405-3637
Email Address:	davis@umd.edu
Campus Address:	2124 Jeong H. Kim Engineering Building
Unit/Department/College:	Electrical & Computer Engineering/ENGR
Constituency (faculty, staff, undergraduate, graduate):	Faculty
Description of issue/concern/policy in question:	<p>In Spring 2013, the University Registrar approached the Senate APAS Committee Coordinator about the desire to add a voting ex-officio member to the committee, in order to ensure that the APAS Committee's work is communicated to the Office of the Registrar throughout the course of the year, so that we can maintain a transparent process. Senate committees rely on the advice of University administrators to guide their work.</p> <p>The APAS Committee has often reviewed a number of items that directly impact the Office of the Registrar and its functions, including the Proposal to Review the University of Maryland Policies Concerning Academic Transcripts and Calculation of Grade Point Average (Senate Doc #10-11-11), the Proposal to Change the Minimum Average in all Courses Applied to Undergraduate Major Requirements (Senate Doc #11-12-31), Policies Concerning Academic Transcripts & Calculation of Grade Point Average (Senate Doc #09-10-35), the 30-Credit Hour Rule (Senate Doc #07-08-14), and the Calculation of Commencement Honors (Senate Doc #12-13-03). Topics traditionally reviewed by APAS often affect the Office of the Registrar as much as they affect the Office of the Dean for Undergraduate Studies and the Office of Undergraduate Admissions — both of which have voting ex-officios on the APAS Committee.</p> <p>The committee routinely consults with the Office of the Registrar</p>

	during its review process, and has often been charged specifically with consulting the Registrar (e.g., one of the points of the committee’s charge for the “Proposal to Implement a Retroactive Withdrawal at the University of Maryland (Senate Doc #11-12-30)” was to, “Consult with representatives of the Office of the Registrar on their current procedures and the impact of the proposed changes”).
Description of action/changes you would like to see implemented and why:	Add a representative of the Office of the Registrar to the membership of the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee. It would be administratively effective and beneficial if a permanent, voting ex-officio is added to the APAS Committee beginning with the 2013-2014 academic year.
Suggestions for how your proposal could be put into practice:	<p>The Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee could be charged with reviewing this request. ERG could then determine whether it should be recommended that a representative of the Office of the Registrar be added to APAS as a voting ex-officio member, who would be appointed annually by the Registrar. If so, the ERG Committee could recommend a change to Article 6 (Standing Committee Specifications) in the Senate Bylaws to account for this membership edit, as follows:</p> <p>6.1 Academic Procedures and Standards Committee: 6.1.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; ten (10) faculty members; three (3) undergraduate and two (2) graduate students; and the following persons or a representative of each: the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Director of Undergraduate Admissions, the University Registrar, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies, and the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School.</p>
Additional Information:	The University Registrar is supportive of this proposal request.

Please send your completed form and any supporting documents to senate-admin@umd.edu or University of Maryland Senate Office, 1100 Marie Mount Hall, College Park, MD 20742-7541. Thank you!



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	12-13-06
Title:	Review of the Coursera Program
Presenter:	Wolfgang Losert, Chair, Educational Affairs Committee
Date of SEC Review:	April 8, 2013
Date of Senate Review:	April 17, 2013
Voting (highlight one):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	<p>Coursera is a new online social entrepreneurship company with a mission to offer free online education with content from top universities. Coursera hosts massively open online courses (MOOCs) provided by institutions and free of charge to students, which attract thousands of students from around the world for each course. In July 2012, the President of the University of Maryland (UMD) announced that the University was exploring joining Coursera. By September 2012, UMD had signed a contract with Coursera to offer six courses on its platform as a pilot. The University Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Educational Affairs Committee with reviewing Coursera and making recommendations on the University's involvement in massively open online courses (MOOCs).</p>
Relevant Policy # & URL:	Not Applicable
Recommendation:	<p>The Educational Affairs Committee recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – that the University continue to participate in the national discussion of MOOCs and to offer MOOCs through Coursera and/or other appropriate platforms, as a means of serving the educational mission of the University. – that MOOCs be selected strategically, considering the research strengths and educational interests of the University and its constituents. – that a MOOC committee be formed to establish procedures and guidelines for developing, delivering, and evaluating MOOCs. The Educational Affairs Committee recommends that the Provost designate a point of contact to work with the committee and to oversee the development, execution, and

	<p>continuing evaluation of MOOCs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ On an ongoing basis, the MOOC committee should be responsible for organizing the review of proposals and selecting new MOOCs to be developed. ○ The MOOC committee should have broad representation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should include faculty, staff, graduate student, and undergraduate student representation, with a faculty majority. • It should include members with relevant expertise in instructional design, pedagogy, and technology. – that MOOCs be developed and viewed as non-credit courses as financial support allows. – that the University recognize the benefits and the risks of providing MOOCs in relation to the public brand of the University, and recommends that the University provide the appropriate resources and infrastructure for the development, execution, and continued evaluation of high-quality MOOCs. The committee recommends that these resources include appropriate support and compensation for faculty who volunteer to develop and deliver these courses. – that the University recognize MOOCs as a way to supplement for-credit courses and augment the educational experience of students at the University. – encouraging faculty and graduate students to become involved with MOOCs as a means to highlight their research and innovation, with the goal of promoting themselves and the University to a global audience. – that the University explore ways to use MOOCs to locate and recruit exceptionally qualified students from around the globe. – that the Office of the Provost regularly report to the Senate on the implementation of these recommendations.
<p>Committee Work:</p>	<p>The Educational Affairs Committee began reviewing Coursera at its meeting on September 25, 2012, and devoted eight meetings to the charge. The committee researched Coursera and other MOOC platforms, met with the Dean of the College of Education who had taken a Coursera course, and met with a UMD MTECH faculty member who is teaching a Coursera course to discuss his expectations and experience with the course.</p> <p>To organize its research, the committee developed a list of key questions and formed four subcommittees to consider these questions in depth. The subcommittees researched peer institutions; whether MOOCs fit with UMD’s educational goals</p>

	<p>and mission; how MOOCs could impact for-credit online courses and teaching at UMD; and whether MOOCs might enhance the University’s research profile.</p> <p>The committee found that there can be risks in providing MOOCs. Inadequate MOOCs could harm the public image of the University.</p> <p>The committee also assessed what possible tangible benefits may result from providing MOOCs. MOOCs can help the University fulfill and expand its educational mission, and can be used to showcase the strengths of the University to a global audience. MOOCs can enhance the prominence of research enterprises and define UMD faculty as leaders in their fields. Faculty and graduate students who develop courses may increase their visibility in the field and disseminate their research worldwide. Students may also be able to use MOOCs to learn specialized topics or hone particular skills that could augment their for-credit educational experience at UMD. The development of MOOCs may lead to reevaluation of for-credit online education, and could lead to opportunities to provide modules in specialized knowledge for government and corporate partners. Further, MOOCs may provide opportunities for alumni and others to renew and maintain connections to the University.</p> <p>Throughout its review, the committee weighed the critical issues of support and resources for MOOCs, the quality and selection criteria for courses, how to ensure successful execution of MOOCs, and ways to evaluate the success of courses, among other issues. After much review, the Educational Affairs Committee voted to approve nine recommendations on MOOCs and send them forward for consideration.</p>
Alternatives:	The Senate could reject the recommendations and the University would lack guidance on further participation in and implementation of MOOCs.
Risks:	Providing MOOCs through Coursera or other platforms may present risks related to the public image of the University. However, not providing MOOCs may present the risk of putting UMD at a competitive disadvantage.
Financial Implications:	Financial resources would be needed to carry out some of the recommendations, in order to adequately support the successful development and execution of MOOCs.
Further Approvals Required:	Senate approval, Presidential approval.

Senate Educational Affairs Committee

Senate Document # 12-13-06

Review of the Coursera Program

April 2013

BACKGROUND

In July 2012, the President of the University of Maryland (UMD) announced that the University was exploring joining Coursera, a new online educational platform that attracts thousands of students from around the world for each online course. By September 2012, UMD had signed a contract with Coursera to offer six courses on its platform as a pilot. In September 2012, the University Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Educational Affairs Committee with reviewing the Coursera program and making recommendations on the University's involvement in massively open online courses (MOOCs) beyond its initial six pilot courses.

CURRENT PRACTICE

In April 2012, Andrew Ng and Daphne Koller launched Coursera, a social entrepreneurship company with a mission to offer free online education with content from top universities. Coursera hosts massively open online courses (MOOCs) provided by institutions and free of charge to students. Courses are not for credit, and each course has a fixed start and end date with weekly assignments. Registering for courses requires only an email address. Courses generally have no requirements for textbooks or materials that are not widely available for free online and varying suggested prerequisites. Coursera courses range from four weeks to twelve weeks, and most feature video lectures presented in eight to twelve minute segments, which have quizzes or other interactive features built in. Assessments are conducted through auto-grading or peer grading, in which students use rubrics to grade the work of their peers. Each course also hosts a discussion forum, in which students can ask questions, collaborate, or discuss aspects of the course.

On September 19, 2012, UMD announced that it had formalized an agreement to join Coursera as a pilot venture. The contract with Coursera is not exclusive and the University made no financial commitment to Coursera. UMD agreed to provide six courses in 2013 as a pilot. Provost Wylie asked academic deans to identify faculty, and four faculty members were selected based on criteria involving which courses would be ready on a short timeframe, the general appeal of the topics, and other issues. Each faculty member worked with the Division of Information Technology (DivIT) to create a video description of the course, and is currently working with DivIT in the development and delivery of the course. Upon completion of each course, each student will receive a statement of accomplishment from Coursera. The University of Maryland does not offer credit for these courses.

COMMITTEE WORK

In September 2012, the Educational Affairs Committee was charged with reviewing Coursera and making recommendations on the University's involvement in MOOCs. Over the course of the 2012-2013 academic year, the committee devoted eight meetings to consideration of the charge. It researched Coursera and other MOOC platforms, met with the Dean of the College of Education who had taken a

Coursera course, and met twice with a UMD MTECH faculty member who is teaching a Coursera course to discuss his expectations and experiences with the course. Based on the charge from the SEC and this initial research the committee developed a list of key questions and formed four subcommittees to consider these questions in depth. The subcommittees reported their findings and recommendations to the full Educational Affairs Committee.

❖ *Peer Institutions*

The Peer Institutions Subcommittee found that many of our peer institutions are engaged in MOOCs. The University of California at Berkeley offers courses through edX, and four peer universities offer courses through Coursera: the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, University of Michigan, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and University of California Irvine.

The methods for selecting courses vary. Some institutions, such as the University of Michigan, ask Deans to suggest courses, while others, like the University of Illinois and UNC, have a campus-level review committee that reviews proposals and selects courses to be delivered. UNC's task force on MOOCs is also responsible for identifying criteria by which courses will be selected as a way of guiding the course selection process, an idea that UC Irvine indicated it may explore further in the next round of course proposals.

None of UMD's peer institutions currently offer course credit for MOOCs. Some institutions deliberately determined that credit would not be offered so as not to interfere with for-credit online courses, while others have made no firm decision against future credit for MOOCs but do not offer credit at this time. Institutions consent to providing Statements of Accomplishment that do not denote any sort of credit.

The cost associated with participating in MOOC platforms is tangible and in some cases substantial, but it was unclear among peers whether benefits outweigh costs. At many institutions, it remained unclear what business model exists and what, if any, monetary benefits may come from offering MOOCs. However, each institution believes participation yields non-monetary benefits. These range from publicity of the institution and its areas of excellence, to fulfillment of a public interest in helping to bring down higher education costs, to global public service as part of an educational mission, to learning more effective ways to use technology to improve for-credit course offerings.

In analyzing its findings, the Peer Institutions Subcommittee focused on three points. It discussed establishing a MOOC committee to develop procedures and guidelines for MOOCs as well as to review and select courses. It noted that faculty involvement in courses should be voluntary and that appropriate compensation for time and resources should be awarded. It suggested that courses be developed as non-credit courses, but that discussion of whether to offer credit in the future should continue.

❖ *Educational Goals and Mission*

The Educational Goals and Mission Subcommittee found that offering MOOCs does in fact fit within the context of the educational mission of the University. The mission states that the University is responsible for educating students and advancing knowledge "in areas of importance to the State, the nation, and the world." As a land-grant institution, the University includes in its mission a responsibility to share its research and educational strengths with the State of Maryland and other constituencies outside of the University.

From its discussions with the Office of Undergraduate Studies and the Graduate School, the subcommittee found many ways in which MOOCs support the mission of the University. Perhaps most important is that MOOCs offer the University a new approach in the advancement of knowledge. MOOCs

can be an opportunity for UMD to expand the definition of its mission as a land-grant institution to a worldwide audience, and could in turn offer the University a global perspective in its teaching and learning.

In the future, a high-quality, public higher education degree that is obtainable at a competitive market value will remain an important and valued commodity and likely the strongest indication of broad intellectual ability. However, MOOCs present some powerful educational and pedagogical possibilities, and MOOCs should be thoughtfully incorporated into UMD's educational opportunities.

The subcommittee felt that that UMD should continue to participate in the national discussion of MOOCs and offer MOOCs. However, the subcommittee also noted that careful consideration would need to be given to many issues including accreditation of work completed in a MOOC and strategic approaches to selecting the courses, with the understanding that the courses will represent the University on a global scale.

❖ *Online Courses and Teaching*

The Online Courses and Teaching Subcommittee found that there could be several benefits to incorporating MOOCs into for-credit coursework. MOOCs can be seen as a potential resource to supplement course content when assigned instead of or together with a textbook. Assuming the faculty member has evaluated the MOOC and found the quality and content to be appropriate, faculty could use this resource to augment for-credit courses. This could enrich the learning and discussion taking place in for-credit courses, by providing exposure to different global perspectives. This broader impact can be gained by using an existing MOOC and its materials as a resource in a for-credit course, or by providing a portion of the for-credit course as a MOOC.

Teaching MOOCs will have benefits for the faculty developing and teaching the courses. Transferring course content to an online MOOC format will lead to a process of evaluation and reflection on the content and pedagogy of the course. The course delivery, content, and assessments need to be very different in MOOCs than in face-to-face for-credit courses, and so this process allows the opportunity for improvement through re-evaluation.

Success in MOOCs will require that courses have high-quality content and delivery. In looking at the criteria for selecting courses, course content, ease of delivery of instruction and materials, and peer interaction should all play a role in determining quality. As a critical point of exposure to UMD, the University needs to be sure it is making the most of the opportunity to emphasize strengths and present a positive image. The subcommittee noted that courses should take into account the internationality of the audience, and should seek to emphasize the strengths of the University. The subcommittee consulted with the Division of Information Technology, and it is clear that from a technological standpoint, the University will need to support the MOOCs appropriately and take steps to ensure that courses run smoothly.

Many variables in offering MOOCs and in using MOOC content in for-credit courses are unknown, and the subcommittee felt further discussion will be needed as the University moves forward. The subcommittee suggested that discussions should continue related to how to develop MOOC courses and how to embed content from existing MOOC courses in for-credit courses; issues of faculty and graduate assistant time, related to compensation; and how to select MOOC courses that correspond with the desired branding in content and quality.

❖ *Research and MOOCs*

The Research and MOOCs Subcommittee found that although MOOCs are generally not (yet) creating new knowledge, research at UMD might be highly affected by involvement in MOOCs. They can play a role in the dissemination of knowledge, and can be used to showcase UMD's research strengths. In this way, if done well, MOOCs would clearly be able to enhance the visibility of UMD's research enterprises and define UMD faculty as leaders in various fields.

As an example of possible impacts, faculty and graduate students who refer to their own publications in a MOOC may see increases in citations for their work. For graduate education, students may be able to use MOOCs to learn specialized topics, such as research tools or methods. In addition, a MOOC may provide an introduction to a new area of study, which may especially help with interdisciplinary research. Even if not given graduate credit, the knowledge may be important in achieving research goals.

The subcommittee noted that there are risks related to MOOCs and research. Not engaging in MOOCs can allow competitors and competing institutions to define themselves as the leaders in various fields or areas of research. However, there are risks to providing MOOCs as well; the global audience for the course and the possible indirect benefits of the course make it clear the MOOCs must be carefully planned and successfully executed. To produce a successful MOOC, researchers will need help, including script writing, videography, IT support, and assessment support.

From its discussions with the Division of Research, the subcommittee found that building relationships with government and corporate partners, many of which often ask UMD for specialized courses or training for employees, further enhances the University's research profile. As our understanding of online courses and MOOCs grows, the Division of Research may be able to use MOOC technology or methodology to provide training to select groups in areas of specialized knowledge.

As a result of its deliberations, the subcommittee suggested that UMD embrace MOOCs as a supplement to learning for current graduate students and encourage faculty and graduate students to become involved with MOOCs to highlight their research and promote themselves to a global audience. The subcommittee was also interested in exploring ways to use MOOCs to locate and recruit outstanding international students. Recognizing the benefits and risks associated with MOOCs will be critical, and the subcommittee suggested providing resources and infrastructure for the development of high quality MOOCs and involving the Division of Research in the selection of course topics and the assessment of how well courses are perceived.

❖ *Additional Considerations*

Throughout its review, the Educational Affairs Committee considered the issue of support and resources for MOOCs at UMD to be of critical importance. Since courses are currently being offered as a pilot program, the University is learning about the resources needed and many reports have indicated that more resources may be necessary than initially imagined. For example, the Division of Information Technology initially thought that a degree of support could be completed by graduate assistants, but since has found that the support required exceeded those expectations. The committee discussed other types of support as well, including instructional support and assessment support, and stressed throughout its discussions that it considered the adequate support of these courses and the faculty teaching them to be of critical importance.

The committee also discussed the quality and selection of courses at length. It agreed that how content is presented and the quality of the content itself will be key in the image UMD puts forward. The committee discussed ways to ameliorate this concern, including providing support to instructors in writing scripts for

videos and in developing assessments, in addition to technological support. The committee also discussed how to train faculty to teach MOOC courses, and noted that some explanation of expectations should be created.

As a way of ensuring that MOOC courses are being selected and executed appropriately, the committee discussed having a centralized office be responsible for MOOCs. Staff in such an office could be critical to provide an institutional memory, and such an office could be a contact point for departments and create guidelines for how MOOC courses should be delivered and developed at UMD. The committee suggests that the Provost's Office may be appropriate, as the place where the educational mission, graduate education, and undergraduate education all intersect.

In addition to oversight in the University administration, the committee discussed creating a MOOC Committee, such as those created at peer institutions. Such a committee may be able to have a quality control role over the selection and execution of MOOC courses. It could provide guidance for those who want to be involved, and include information on best practices for assessments and other key points. Such a committee might also consider how the University could use MOOCs to benefit students at UMD as well.

Finally, the committee noted that MOOCs are already starting to be used by some institutions as a tool for alumni relations: some universities have encouraged alumni to get engaged in MOOCs from their alma mater either as voluntary TAs or as course takers. The committee discussed similar ways in which MOOCs might expand opportunities for alumni and others to renew and maintain connections to the University.

RECOMMENDATIONS

At its meeting on March 27th, 2013, the Educational Affairs Committee voted in favor of the following recommendations related to the University of Maryland's involvement in the Coursera program and other MOOC platforms.

1. The Educational Affairs Committee recommends that the University continue to participate in the national discussion of MOOCs and to offer MOOCs through Coursera and/or other appropriate platforms, as a means of serving the educational mission of the University.
2. The Educational Affairs Committee recommends that MOOCs be selected strategically, considering the research strengths and educational interests of the University and its constituents.
3. The Educational Affairs Committee recommends that a MOOC committee be formed to establish procedures and guidelines for developing, delivering, and evaluating MOOCs. The Educational Affairs Committee recommends that the Provost designate a point of contact to work with the committee and to oversee the development, execution, and continuing evaluation of MOOCs.
 - a. On an ongoing basis, the MOOC committee should be responsible for organizing the review of proposals and selecting new MOOCs to be developed.
 - b. The MOOC committee should have broad representation:
 - i. It should include faculty, staff, graduate student, and undergraduate student representation, with a faculty majority.
 - ii. It should include members with relevant expertise in instructional design, pedagogy, and technology.
4. The Educational Affairs Committee recommends that MOOCs be developed and viewed as non-credit courses as financial support allows.

5. The Educational Affairs Committee recommends that the University recognize the benefits and the risks of providing MOOCs in relation to the public brand of the University, and recommends that the University provide the appropriate resources and infrastructure for the development, execution, and continued evaluation of high-quality MOOCs. The committee recommends that these resources include appropriate support and compensation for faculty who volunteer to develop and deliver these courses.
6. The Educational Affairs Committee recommends that the University recognize MOOCs as a way to supplement for-credit courses and augment the educational experience of students at the University.
7. The Educational Affairs Committee recommends encouraging faculty and graduate students to become involved with MOOCs as a means to highlight their research and innovation, with the goal of promoting themselves and the University to a global audience.
8. The Educational Affairs Committee recommends that the University explore ways to use MOOCs to locate and recruit exceptionally qualified students from around the globe.
9. The Educational Affairs Committee recommends that the Office of the Provost regularly report to the Senate on the implementation of these recommendations.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Charge from the Senate Executive Committee on the Review of the Coursera Program

**APPENDIX 1 - CHARGE FROM THE SENATE EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE ON THE REVIEW OF THE COURSERA PROGRAM**



**University Senate
CHARGE**

Date:	September 17, 2012
To:	Wolfgang Losert Chair, Educational Affairs
From:	Martha Nell Smith  Chair, University Senate
Subject:	Review of the Coursera Program
Senate Document #:	12-13-06
Deadline:	February 15, 2013

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) requests that the Educational Affairs Committee review Coursera, a social entrepreneurship company that partners with universities to offer courses online for free, and make recommendations on what the University's involvement in this program should be.

Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Review the Coursera and other Massive Open Online Courses (MOOC) models for offering courses online. For example, how do MOOCs (Coursera, EdX, and other initiatives) fit in with UM's educational mission? Are there possibilities for expansion and deepening of our educational goals?
2. Consider various pros and cons of participating in this type of instructional platform.
3. Consider whether and how MOOCs might enhance UM's profile as a research one institution.
4. Consider whether MOOCs should be built on our existing courses (as are our pilots), be new courses developed specifically as MOOCs, or both.
5. Consider how MOOCs might fit into degree programs as for-credit courses
6. Consider the financial implications of adding these types of courses to our curricula.
7. Consider the impact of offering free online courses on our educational mission.
8. Review the involvement of our peer institutions in Coursera or other similar programs.

The committee should feel free to explore additional questions that might arise in the course of its considerations.

We ask that you submit your report and recommendations to the Senate Office no later than February 15, 2013. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.

Subject: Blended and Online Education

Date: Wednesday, July 25, 2012 5:38:13 PM ET

From: President Wallace Loh and Provost Ann Wylie

July 25, 2012

Dear University of Maryland community:

Leading research universities are engaging in technology-enabled education on a larger scale and at a quickened pace. We want to update you on developments in this area at the University of Maryland.

Many of our faculty members already offer blended learning courses, online courses, and other technology-mediated courses. Today's students have grown up electronically connected all the time. Our Division of Information Technology and Center for Teaching Excellence provide outstanding support for these forms of pedagogy.

Nobody knows for sure what will be the long-term impact of new technological advances on higher education. We believe that the University of Maryland must develop an innovative, strategic, and judicious approach to these developments.

Therefore, we are forming the Provost's Commission on Blended and Online Education. Its charge begins with determining the full extent of technology deployment on campus. Then, it will recommend ways to improve and expand the technology-enabled education that we offer on campus and to the world beyond. The work of this group will enable us to make the most of what we are already doing and accelerate progress. It will host open forums in the fall for the University community.

We are pleased that Dean Jane Clark of our School of Public Health (jeclark@umd.edu) has agreed to serve as chair of this Provost's Commission. It will include faculty, deans, staff, students, and possibly external stakeholders.

In the meantime, we are exploring joining Coursera, the "social entrepreneurship" company that partners with universities to offer online courses for free. Started by two Stanford professors, it currently has 14 AAU universities and two European counterparts as members of this consortium. Coursera's technology platform supports MOOCs (massive open online courses) that attract tens of thousands of students from around the world. MOOCs can also be blended with face-to-face learning in the classroom.

To start, we would provide three to four outstanding courses from interested faculty members representing various disciplines. There is no upfront fee and no obligation to remain. We would be free to form other partnerships in this fast-changing environment. (Earlier this year, Harvard and MIT announced "edX," a joint platform to put all their courses online and for free. UC-Berkeley just joined them.) By partnering with Coursera sooner rather than later, we can learn from this educational venture as we continue to assess and develop our own pedagogical innovations.

All of us are committed to making a University of Maryland education even more excellent, accessible, and affordable. Our faculty and staff are continually engaged in improving the learning and teaching process. We invite your participation in the open forums this fall. The work of this Provost's Commission will help us thrive in a world reshaped by information technology, globalization, and a changing economy.

Sincerely,

Wallace D. Loh, President and Ann Wylie, Provost

cc: Mary Ann Rankin, Provost-Designate

This note was authorized for distribution to
University of Maryland Community by: