

University Senate

April 7, 2011

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 92

Call to Order

Senate Chair Mabbs called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

Chair Mabbs asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the March 2, 2011 meeting. Hearing none, she declared the minutes approved as distributed.

Report of the Chair

Committee Volunteer Period

Mabbs 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 22, 2011.

Remaining Senate Meeting

Mabbs reminded Senators that there were only two more Senate meetings this academic year. The next meeting, on April 21, 2011 will be the last business meeting of the semester for outgoing senators. The May 4, 2011 transition meeting will be for all continuing and incoming senators. Eric Kasischke 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 will be distributed prior to that meeting.

CUSF Exec Committee/System Senate Chairs Meeting

Mabbs explained that she had recently attended a meeting of the Council of University System Faculty (CUSF) Executive Committee and the other University System of Maryland Senate Chairs. The primary topic of discussion was the benefits issues being debated by the Maryland State General Assembly. She explained that there would be no furloughs but increases in the cost of benefits were expected. She briefly reviewed some of the anticipated changes and directed the Senate to the senate website for an overview document of the expected benefits changes.

UMB/UMCP Merger

Mabbs explained that several senators had raised concerns regarding the recent announcement that the General Assembly was considering a proposal to conduct a study on the possible merger of the University of Maryland Baltimore and University of Maryland College Park campuses. She announced that President Loh will be

coming to the May 4, 2011 Senate Meeting to give his current thoughts about the merger. He is also willing to take questions from the Senate floor.

Committee Reports

PCC Proposal to Modify the Curriculum of the M.A. in Spanish Language and Literature by Adding a Concentration in Hispanic Applied Linguistics (Senate Doc. No. 10-11-47) (Action)

David Salness, Chair of the Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the proposal to add a concentration in Hispanic Applied Linguistics to the Senate and provided background information.

Mabbs opened the floor to discussion; hearing none, she called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 73 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

ERG Report on Representation of Single-Member Constituencies (Senate Doc. No. 09-10-38) (Action)

Marc Pound, Chair of the Elections, Representation & Governance (ERG) Committee, presented the proposal to apportion the single member constitutions into the Plan of Organization and to hold the Plan of Organization review process in year seven to the Senate and provided background information.

Mabbs opened the floor to discussion of the proposal.

Senator Miller, Emeritus Faculty, questioned the accuracy of the data on the emeriti population. He stated that the data received from the Institutional Research Planning & Assessment (IRPA) Office was often inaccurate.

Pound responded that the data collected by the committee came from IRPA so the committee could only rely on the data that was given to them. However, the main point of this proposal is that the single member constituencies need to be reevaluated because they should only be a stepping-stone to reapportionment.

Senator Newhagen, Faculty, College of Journalism, stated that the past Plan of Organization asked for a review every five year but this was extended to at least ten years during the last review process. He did not understand why changing it to seven was necessary.

Pound clarified that the Committee was recommending that the frequency for review remain as "at least ten years" but that the next review be conducted in year seven.

Senator Newhagen, Faculty, College of Journalism, asked whom the Committee was recommending be reapportioned.

Pound responded that their recommendation was for the Plan of Organization Review Committee to consider reapportioning the single member constituencies such as the instructors, emeritus faculty, and research faculty.

Mabbs called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 64 in favor, 9 opposed, and 13 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Faculty Affairs Committee Report on University Policies Related to Lecturers/Instructors & Research Faculty (Senate Doc. No. 10-11-04) (Action)

Robert Schwab, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, presented the proposal to establish a task force to review the processes for instructor/lecturers and research faculty. They also recommended that a survey be conducted of these constituencies and the policies and procedures for them be made clearer. Pound presented the proposal to the Senate and provided background information.

Mabbs opened the floor to discussion of the proposal.

Senator Pound, Research Faculty, thanked the Committee for their report but questioned why they focused on instructional faculty and not the research faculty. He stated that many of the grievances that he has heard from the research faculty echo what is stated in the report. He hopes that the proposed task force can focus on all non-tenure-track faculty.

Senator Gullickson, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that in her past experience as an Associate Dean in the Graduate School, there were several non-tenure-track faculty members who wanted to apply for research awards to support their research activities. She encouraged the task force to look into that issue as well and to work with the Graduate School on the issue.

Mabbs called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 74 in favor, 6 opposed, and 4 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Report of the Task Force on Age-Related Faculty Issues (Senate Doc. No. 09-10-39) (Action)

James Gilbert, Chair of the Task Force on Age-Related Faculty Issues, presented to the Senate the proposal to help facilitate the retirement process and engage emeritus faculty and provided background information.

Mabbs opened the floor to discussion of the proposal.

Senator Gullickson, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that the report mentions that other institutions have procedures for phased-in retirement that we do not have but does not give specifics.

Gilbert responded that phased retirement programs are not allowed in the State of Maryland. Stanford University requires it, but the State of Maryland feels that it

should not be offered to the University faculty if there are not similar programs for other state workers.

Gullickson asked if we could petition for phased retirement?

Ellin Scholnick, Member of the Task Force on Age Related Faculty Issues, stated that the Provost's Office had tried to implement a phased retirement program but the State Attorney General and the Governor ultimately rejected the program.

Senator Kahn, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, stated that many faculty would be much more willing to retire if we were not guided into the Optional Retirement Program (ORP). There are great examples of exceptional ways that an emeritus faculty member can contribute to the life of the campus. Jerry Miller is an example...but we do not want to set up any incentive that would allow for abuse.

Gilbert responded that the task force's report does not encourage people to retire nor for units to hire them back to teach. They would simply like to make the retirement process clearer and find ways to allow emeritus faculty to reengage.

Senator Gulick, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, stated that he felt the recommendation about space should be stronger. There are retired faculty that have no space. If they are active, they should definitely have space. We need to rethink how we provide space for current faculty and retired faculty.

Senator Buchanan, Faculty, College of Agriculture and Natural Sciences, stated that providing space is not sufficient. There also needs to be more resources so that emeritus faculty can provide a meaningful contribution.

Gilbert agreed that space was the least that the University could provide.

Mabbs called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 70 in favor, 5 opposed, and 6 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

University Library Council Report on the University Open Access Movement: A Proposal for Broad University Engagement (Senate Doc. No. 10-11-32) (Action)

Martha Nell Smith, Chair of the University Library Council, presented the proposal to create a joint task force to review and educate on the issues of open access to the Senate and provided background information.

Mabbs opened the floor to discussion of the proposal.

Senator Miller, Emeritus Faculty, stated that the issue was well analyzed by the Library Council but he had concerns about the term "dynamic situation" because things are changing so rapidly. He was also concerned about the effectiveness of a task force because of its temporary nature as opposed to a long-term established

body. The issue of staff support is also troublesome. A task force could only work if there was adequate amount of professional staff support to work with the university community on these issues. In the absence of this support, he was concerned that the Task Force will fail without leaving a legacy that can deal with the dynamic situation of open access. There needs to be a commitment on the part of the administration to support an effort that will yield something that will benefit the campus in the long run. Policies that can react in a nimble fashion are necessary.

Smith responded that inaction is not an option. We are asking for a task force, but we understand that it will not come up with the solution. The University needs to make a statement about open access even if it is that one size does not fit all. They need to give some guidance to the campus.

Senator Owen, Faculty, Libraries, stated that he agreed with Senator Miller's comments. He also commended the Library Council for their efforts. He explained that the 2009 Open Access Resolution did reveal that extensive education is needed. We need to address the needs of the various disciplines. He supported the Council's recommendations and encouraged the Senate to support it as well. He also stated that the Libraries welcome the opportunity to assist in the education component of the process.

Senator Pop, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, stated that we could not claim to educate and help minorities and the underprivileged constituents without supporting open access. A lot of these journals take away our rights in order to publish even work that is not directly edited by the journal. He suggested that work produced by someone at the University should be retained in the original version to be deposited in the Digital Repository at the University of Maryland (DRUM). We are extremely late on this issue. 10-15 universities have already made strong statements on this issue. We are falling behind and we cannot afford to do that.

Smith responded that that is why inaction is not an option. Some institutions are backtracking from their initial stances on open access. That is why we are recommended that a careful review be conducted.

Senator Buchanan, Faculty, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, stated that he could not find any action items aside from establishing a task force.

Smith responded that the Library Council cannot set policy but does believe that this is an issue that needs to be considered in depth by a task force.

Dean Steele, Voting Ex-Officio, Libraries, stated that this is an important issue for the Libraries and is a part of their strategic plan. They are willing to find ways to make some aspects of the recommendation happen. She hopes that there are some aspects that can be worked on more quickly than others because the issue has many layers. She also thanked the Library Council for their reasoned discussion and study of the issue. She urged the Senate to support the proposal.

Smith stated that Dean Steele has been a leader in educating on open access issues.

Mabbs called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 68 in favor, 4 opposed, and 5 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Unfinished Business

PCC Proposal to Reorganize and Rename the Departments in the College of Education (Senate Doc. No. 10-11-41) (Action)

Mabbs explained that the Senate would continue debate on the PCC Proposal to Reorganize and Rename the Departments in the College of Education because it was unfinished business from the last meeting. She stated that an addendum to the proposal, outlining the College of Education's actions since our last meeting, has been included in the materials.

Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Procedural Motion

Mabbs stated that the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) has submitted a procedural motion, which limits each speaker to five minutes. She further explained that Robert's Rules of Order dictate that no speaker can speak again until all those who wish to speak have had the opportunity.

Mabbs opened the floor to discussion of the procedural motion; hearing none, she called for a vote on the motion. The result was 64 in favor, 10 opposed, and 1 abstention. **The motion to limit speakers to five minutes passed.**

Discussion of the Proposal

Dean Wiseman, Voting Ex-Officio, College of Education, stated that since the last Senate meeting, the College of Education has provided in the addendum a rebuttal to the issues raised at the last meeting and results of the vote on whether or not to reorganize the college. She explained that the reorganization is a change to departmental structures not a change to programs. It does not alter or eliminate any individual programs or degrees at this time. She also gave history and background on the reorganization process since its inception as well as the rationale for the reorganization. She also stated that the University's Strategic Plan and the economic climate guided them towards the reorganization. Wiseman explained that internal and external reviews were conducted, all of which commented on program and faculty "silos" within the College, lack of sustained collaborations across departments, and redundancy in course work and programs. Students also commented on the benefit of cross-departmental work and more collaboration and cooperation among the faculty in different areas. Wiseman stated that she was encouraged to consider the idea of reorganization by the Provost. While she did make the decision to consider reorganization, she honored the principles of shared governance throughout the process. Faculty had opportunities to voice concerns, propose alternate models, and take an active role in the shaping of the College's

future. Faculty, staff, and students were encouraged to participate in the process. The proposed reorganization is based on two years of work and from a realization that the College cannot fiscally support multiple small departments and redundancy in programs and course offerings. Great colleges continue to innovate, create, and build to their existing excellence. Wiseman thanked the numerous faculty, staff, and students for their hard work on the proposal and urged the Senate to approve the proposal.

Senator Stromquist, Faculty, College of Education, responded to the question of what prompted the reorganization. She stated that the decision was guided by Provost Farvardin who made it clear that the College's ability to secure future support and funding was linked to a reduction in the number of departments. The rationale was the need for greater interaction among faculty and the need to avoid small and inefficient units and programs. The parameter of change was to reduce the number of departments into a manageable state. College-wide input was gathered and questions arose about whether small meant inefficient. The financial implications from the reorganization have not been fully examined. There was a fear that program identity would be lost. New departmental cultures and joint curriculum offerings will be negotiated next academic year. Thus far, program rankings have not been affected by rumors of reorganization. The lengthy process has resulted in a decline in morale so many constituents would like to move forward. The vote on the reorganization revealed 75% of the constituents were in favor of the reorganization.

Senator Miletich, Undergraduate, College of Arts & Humanities, thanked the College for their work since the last meeting. He stated that the addendum made their goals very clear and concise.

Senator Yuravlivker, Graduate Student, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, thanked the Dean for her presentation. The materials address the concerns raised at the last meeting so he is happy to vote for this proposal.

Senator Petkas, Exempt Staff, raised some concerns about impact on staff in the reorganization. He stated that page 14 of the proposal states that the current FTE will move with the current department for faculty and graduate students but there is no mention of staff. He asked for a clarification on whether staff would lose jobs as a result of the reorganization.

Dean Wiseman responded that no staff members would lose their positions because of the reorganization.

Senator Stromquist, Faculty, College of Education introduced Jessica Bancroft to speak on behalf of the College of Education's staff. She stated that the reorganization-helped staff re-evaluate how they were doing things and whether they were effective and efficient. She was very pleased with how the reorganization has progressed. As an advisor, her interaction with students has been positive regarding the reorganization and she has seen no negative impact on the students especially in terms of course offerings.

Senator Rowe, Faculty, College of Education, introduced David Imig, Chair of the College of Education Senate. Imig described the process since the last Senate meeting. He explained that the College Senate is the representative body of the College. It adopted a resolution calling for Dean Wiseman to respond to the University Senate's concerns and encouraged her to move forward with the reorganization by a vote of 15 in favor, 3 against, and 1 abstention. The College was encouraged to hold a vote of the College Assembly on support of the actions of the College Senate and the reorganization. He stated that 75% of those who voted affirmed the action of the College Senate and move forward on the reorganization. He affirmed that the process according to their Plan of Organization was followed and urged the Senate to approve the reorganization proposal.

Senator Pound, Research Faculty, expressed concerns from a constituent about the voting process. He stated that research faculty members were not allowed to vote in the beginning of the process, there was a rule change that not voting was considered a no vote, it was not clear what they were voting on.

David Imig responded that the process was in accordance with the College Plan of Organization. The College of Education is much more inclusive, including all faculty not just tenured/tenure-track faculty. However, in order to conform to the Plan, there were some changes made. The results do reflect the research faculty. He said there was some confusion but a clarifying email was sent on what was being voted upon.

Greg Hancock, Non-Voting Ex-Officio & Chair of the Department of Measurement, Statistics and Evaluation, stated that he understands that there are many people whom he does not speak for and many that he does speak for. He asked if anyone believes that this reorganization will take the College from being good to great. He does not think so because the College's Strategic Plan already outlines preeminent, interdisciplinary, diversity oriented and technology oriented regardless of the reorganization. He does not think it is clear what value is added by the reorganization. He stated that the proposal is only for a change in the administrative structure and not programs and degrees. Hancock does not believe that great change can be brought about without programmatic change or a foundational and identity defining vision. He also questioned the data from the voting results, stating that it could be construed that less than 50% of the College was committed to the reorganization. There is no way to infer that there is the strong internal support that is essential to the reorganization. There is not enough in the proposal including commitment to make the College great. He respectfully requested that the Senate vote against the proposal. Hancock also stated that he was committed to working cooperatively to make the best possible future for his department, college, and campus.

Senator Stromquist, Faculty, College of Education introduced Robert Lent, who stated that he served as immediate past chair of the College of Education Senate. He gave his insight on the process including the various forms of input representation from all constituencies. There is a thoughtful minority that is not

happy with the outcome but their criticism was acknowledged and discussed to the extent possible. At the end of the day, the majority of voters in the College have endorsed the reorganization. He asked the Senate to honor their governance process and vote in favor of the reorganization.

Senator Miller, Emeritus Faculty, stated that two concerns raised at the last meeting still have not been addressed. There has been no review of the programs within the College and that function should guide structure when reorganizing the College. He also raised concerns about whether large departments could be nimble. Miller also called the question.

Chair Mabbs clarified that Miller's motion to call the question, would have to be voted on immediately and, if passed, would result in the Senate immediately moving to a vote on the proposal.

Mabbs called for a vote on the motion to call the question. The result was 48 in favor, 14 against, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to end debate on the proposal passed.**

Mabbs stated that the Senate would now vote on the proposal. The result was 46 in favor, 16 opposed, and 6 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

New Business

Mabbs opened the floor to new business.

Senator Miller, Emeritus Faculty, stated that he would like to present the following resolution for adoption by the Senate.

"The Senate Chair, Chair-Elect, and the Senate Executive Committee find and implement effective ways of making presentations to the Committees of the Board of Regents, the Board of Regents, and at legislative hearings in Annapolis on issues of substantial concern to the constituent groups of the University Senate."

Mabbs asked for a second to the motion and received one. She opened the floor to discussion of the resolution; hearing none, she called for a voice vote on the resolution. The result was unanimous in favor of the resolution. **The resolution passed.**

Adjournment

Senate Chair Mabbs adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.