

## **University Senate**

April 17, 2014

### **Members Present**

Members present at the meeting: 90

### **Call to Order**

Senate Chair Novara called the meeting to order at 3:22 p.m.

### **Approval of the Minutes**

Chair Novara asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the April 2, 2014 meeting. Hearing none, he declared the minutes approved as distributed.

### **Report of the Chair**

#### Committee Volunteer Period

Novara explained that the volunteer period for Senate standing committees had recently opened. He encouraged senators to reach out to the campus community about participating in shared governance and encouraged the campus community to volunteer to serve on a committee by going to [www.senate.umd.edu](http://www.senate.umd.edu). He especially encouraged faculty to volunteer and encourage other faculty to volunteer. The deadline to volunteer is May 2, 2014.

#### Remaining Senate Meetings

Novara reminded Senators that this was the last business meeting of the semester for any outgoing Senators. He asked them to stand and be recognized for their service.

Novara noted that the May 7, 2014 transition meeting would be for all continuing and incoming senators. Don Webster will begin his term 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 would be distributed to incoming and continuing senators later that day. The agenda and any additional materials for that meeting will be sent out on April 30, 2014.

### **Committee Reports**

#### **2014 CUSS Elections Memo (Senate Doc. No. 13-14-18) (Information)**

Novara stated that the 2014 CUSS Elections Memo had been provided as an informational item from the Staff Affairs Committee. The memo outlines the results from the recent election of Council of University System Staff

representatives for our campus. Three full-time representatives and 3 alternate representatives were elected to serve two-year terms beginning on August 1, 2014.

### **Campus Safety Report 2014 (Senate Doc. No. 13-14-30) (Information)**

Novara stated that the Campus Safety Report had been provided as an informational item from the Campus Affairs Committee. He noted that the report outlines information gathered through a survey and additional outreach efforts and details the top concerns reported by faculty, staff, and students at the University.

### **Review of the University of Maryland Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (Senate Doc. No. 12-13-24) (Action)**

Senator Hurtt, Faculty, School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation, thanked the task force for its extensive work on such complex issues. However, he noted that his colleagues needed more time to consider the report in detail. He made a motion to recommit the report to the task force for further consultation. The motion was seconded.

Novara opened the floor to discussion of the motion. He reminded senators to avoid comments on specific APT cases.

Provost Rankin thanked the task force for its work. The task force was given a very complex charge and worked tirelessly for over a year. She noted that she had not had an opportunity to meet with the task force prior to the Senate meeting. The Deans were concerned that they had not had an opportunity to discuss the recommendations with their chairs. This is the core of our University, so it is important that we all understand what we are signing on for. This is a large document, so it is important to review it carefully. She noted that she looks forward to reviewing the document but admitted that she had not yet had an opportunity to really study it. She supported the motion but noted that there are very fine suggestions in the report. This motion does not suggest that she is unhappy with the report but rather that the campus needs time carefully to consider it in detail. She thanked the task force for its work but asked for time to consider it fully and then discuss it in the fall.

Dean Townshend, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, stated that he had no personal stake in the APT process as an outgoing dean and full professor. However, he is concerned that there has not been sufficient time for consultation. He would like to poll faculty comprehensively in his college. Some concerns may just be related to the precise words; but when it comes to APT the precise word is often critical to the future of a particular academic. He believes that the excellent work of the task force should be rewarded with a careful review of the recommendations.

Bradley Hatfield, Chair of the Joint Provost/Senate APT Guidelines Task Force, stated that the gravity of the APT process is arguably the most important thing that we do, so it is understandable that we should proceed in an appropriate manner if people need time to digest and understand the report. However, he asked that, if the report is delayed, the expectations for the task force be made clear before it is reconsidered.

Senator McClure, Graduate Student, College of Education, recognized the yearlong process with multiple detailed updates at Senate meetings. The report has been available for some time, so he was curious as to how it caught some individuals by surprise. The Senate has had a significant amount of time to consider the work. In considering whether or not the report should be delayed, he encouraged senators to also consider that the Senate has been given ample time to review the document.

Senator Brauth, Faculty, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, stated that his department has not had an opportunity to thoroughly review the document. This is a busy time of year. He asked about the definition of entrepreneurship and how it would be measured and weighted. He also noted that the process by which teaching observations should be conducted and documented should be clarified. Departments are going to have a lot of positive comments, but there are some things that we need to shake out. He applauded the task force's work.

Senator Hurtt, Faculty, School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation, stated that the discussion in his College included both some specific wordsmithing to a few items that were small changes that are consistent with the spirit of the document but also discussion of an inherent conflict between a broader diversity agenda of the University (race, gender etc.) and a restriction on referring to those types of descriptors explicitly in specific cases. There was no suggestion on how best to resolve this. There was a range of these types of concerns.

Senator Davis, Faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering, stated that he was not opposed to the delay, but noted that if the document is an improvement from the current one we could approve it and then fine tune it later. He inquired whether the delay might have a detrimental effect on any faculty already coming up for promotion and tenure. Is this an improvement over what we have now, and should one possibility be to pass it but have a motion to revisit it? However, he did not make a motion to that effect.

Dean Dill, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that we are already underway in the process for candidates coming up now. Even if we approved the report now, we would still be too late for those candidates. She noted that her college is very large, and they have not had an opportunity as a college or in individual departments to discuss this report. This is so important that people need to feel engaged and invested in the document, so that the outcome does reflect

something that they understand. The delay is an opportunity to allow everyone to buy into this so that they feel that their fate is being determined by something that they have had some input on. For that reason, she supported the idea of a delay. She stressed that the delay would not be for the task force to do additional work but rather for a deliberative process in the colleges led by the Deans. If that has taken place, then we should be ready to move ahead in the beginning of the fall.

Dean Banavar, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, noted that his college is large and echoed the sentiments of Dean Dill. This task force has done a tremendous job, and the points are well taken. By and large, they have done a fantastic job. This additional time will really help us to have a fresh perspective in the fall. We have not had time to discuss the report with our departments. He noted that this is one of the most important things that we do. He encouraged senators to delay consideration until we have had more time to discuss the document thoroughly.

Senator Parsons, Exempt-Staff, inquired about the procedure should this be delayed. Should departments discuss it and provide the task force with feedback? Procedurally, how does this process happen?

Novara clarified that we are not voting on procedure but rather on whether or not to recommit the report to the task force. If the motion is approved, the report will go back to the task force for further consultation.

Hearing no further discussion, Novara called for a vote on the motion to recommit the report to the task force for further consultation and noted that the vote only requires a majority. The result was 78 in favor, 5 opposed, and 6 abstentions.  
**The motion passed.**

### **New Business**

There was no new business.

### **Adjournment**

Senate Chair Novara adjourned the meeting at 3:44 p.m.