

University Senate
May 6, 2008

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 89

Call to Order

Senate Chair William Montgomery called the meeting to order at 3:17 p.m.

Report of the Chair

Chair Montgomery introduced Reka Montfort who began as the Senate's new Executive Secretary and Director, on May 5, 2008.

Senate Chair Montgomery explained that, as previously announced, this was a special Senate meeting called to discuss, as the only item of business, the University's proposed Strategic Plan.

Procedure Movement

Senate Chair Montgomery stated that the Senate Executive Committee proposed that each speaker presenting an Amendment or an amendment to an amendment, to the Strategic Plan be given three minutes in which to present and discuss that amendment and that each additional person discussing that Amendment be given two minutes per person for their discussion.

Chair Montgomery, hearing no objection, called for a vote on this procedure motion. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Senator Popper, Biology moved that the discussion of each amendment be limited to a maximum time limit of 20 minutes

Chair Montgomery called for a formal vote of the Senate on this procedural motion. **The motion passed.**

Chair Montgomery informed the Senate that Chair-Elect Holum will time each individual discussion and each total discussion of each amendment. He will then ring a bell in each case when the time limit has been reached.

Senator Doherty, Classics made a procedural motion that the final vote on whether or not to approve the Strategic Plan be conducted with a paper ballot. Chair Montgomery requested that this motion be brought forth after the discussion of the Amendments. There were no objections.

Senate Chair Montgomery stated that the Amendments would be proposed and discussed in the order in which they appear in the Strategic Plan with those

amendments submitted prior to the meeting being proposed and discussed first. Then the floor will be open for additional amendments. He then reminded the Senate of the Senate rules which state that any Member of the Senate may speak and any Member of the Senate may introduce a non-Senator to speak. He also stated that the Members of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, as a Committee of the Senate proposing the document, may speak. He requested that all those who speak, state their name and constituency.

Strategic Plan
Nariman Farvardin
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Provost Farvardin stated that the Strategic Planning Committee was charged by President Mote to be one of "boldness, adventure and high self-expectation". He added that we should "unleash the power of our people, inspire our creativity and merit our commitment to new initiatives that will lift the University's impact higher." The Provost explained that the planning process was highly inclusive, conducting an elaborate study of the University's performance and productivity in the areas of undergraduate education, graduate education, and research and compared our performance with our peers. He stated that we are at a cross-road between status-quo and moving forward, stating "In today's competitive environment, playing it safe is in fact a strategy for decline." He further stated that we have a tremendous opportunity to raise this University to new heights. The Provost urged the Senate to lend its strong endorsement of the Strategic Plan.

Senate Chair Montgomery Introduced President Mote

President Mote thanked the Committee and the Provost for their hard work in developing the Strategic Plan.

Amendments to the Strategic Plan

Amendment #8

Proposed by: Claire Moses (Senator-Faculty, Women's Studies)

Seconded by: Boden Sandstrom (Senator-Full-Time Lecturer, School of Music)

Section: Overview and Background: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats

Subsection: Page 6, column 2, line 8 section "Promoting Community and Inclusiveness,"

after the words "and obligation to" insert:

"encourage research and curricula that advance our understanding of the

complex issues required”

The language that follows will remain as is: “to be a truly inclusive campus, one that embraces underrepresented groups, values differences, and actively nurtures an environment in which people of different cultures and backgrounds enrich and learn from one another.”

Submitted Rationale: “The additional words expand the sentence that follows: "But we cannot be satisfied with diversity 'by the numbers'." Although language recognizing diversity and inclusiveness in scholarship has been added to lists of possible research initiatives, I argue that it is important to note somewhere in the Strategic Plan that the courses and research on this topic are related to "promoting community and inclusiveness" on our campus. This point is not made elsewhere, not even in the current section on undergraduate education.”

Senator Moses then described the Amendment.

Vic Korenman, Member of the Strategic Planning Committee stated that on behalf of the Committee he was happy to agree with this Amendment.

Chair Montgomery called for a formal vote of the Senate to pass the Amendment.
Amendment #8 passed unanimously.

Amendment #12

Proposed by: Roberto Münster (Senator-Undergraduate Student, Business)

Seconded by: Laura Johnson (Senator-Undergraduate Student, Engineering)

Section: Part 1: Institutional Priorities 9 Undergraduate Education

Subsection: Goal 1, Strategy B, page 10

Replace the sentence that now reads: “The unit self-study will include a thorough faculty review of the content and outcomes of programs that includes at least the following elements”

With a sentence that reads: “The unit self-study developed, where appropriate, by faculty, staff and students will include a thorough review of the content and outcomes of programs that includes at least the following elements”

Submitted Rationale: “The current language implies that the review is or should be solely done by faculty. The Policy on the Review of Academic Units (Senate Document 00-01-134) states that faculty, staff and students, where appropriate, will participate in the academic unit self-study. All three groups can provide important input in the review of undergraduate education in academic units and it is important to state that all of them will participate.”

Senator Munster then described the Amendment and Senator Laura Johnson seconded the Amendment.

Vic Korenman, Member of the Strategic Planning Committee stated that on behalf of the Committee he was happy to agree to the 'gist' of this Amendment but stated that the Committee may choose to re-word it slightly.

Chair Montgomery called for a formal vote of the Senate to pass the Amendment. The vote was 0 No, 11 Abstain, Majority Yes. **The motion to approve Amendment #12 passed.**

Amendment #13

Proposed by: Patrick Perfetto, Senator-Exempt Staff
Seconded by: Linda Dalo, Senator-Non-Exempt Staff

Section: Overview and Background-Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

Subsection: Partnerships and Entrepreneurial Initiatives page. 6

In the second sentence, delete: "in ethanol production". Restated, the sentence would read:

"Be it pioneering, the use of technology in the humanities, strengthening the skills of high school science teachers via on-line courses, or nurturing and spinning off path-breaking business opportunities, Maryland's outreach should be over-the – horizon in its creativity and impact."

Senator Perfetto, Conferences and Visitor Services then described the Amendment and mentioned that the existing wording limits the message and distracts from the point. This Amendment was seconded by Senator Dalo, College of Chemical and Life Sciences.

Vic Korenman, Member of the Strategic Planning Committee stated that on behalf of the Committee he was happy to agree to this Amendment.

Chair Montgomery called for a formal vote of the Senate to pass the Amendment. **The motion to approve Amendment #13 passed.**

Amendment #9

Proposed by: Claire Moses (Senator-Faculty, Women's Studies)
Seconded by: Sandy Mack (Senator-Faculty, English)

Section: Part 1: Institutional Priorities: Partnerships, Outreach, and Engagement
Subsection: Page 20, 1st column, line 4, "Engaging the global community,";
and page 24, Goal 3

The proposed Amendment would delete the single word "training" which modifies and limits "programs" in both sentences. This sentence on page 20 would read: "...and expanding programs involving international collaboration." On page 24, the sentence would read: "We will expand the global reach of University programs through programs on campus..."

Senator Moses, Women's Studies then described the Amendment which was seconded by Senator Mack, English.

Vic Korenman, Member of the Strategic Planning Committee stated that on behalf of the Committee that he was happy to agree to this Amendment.

Chair Montgomery called for a formal vote of the Senate to pass the Amendment. The vote was 0 No, 1 Abstain, Majority Yes. **The motion to approve Amendment #9 passed.**

Senator Gullickson, History informed the Senate that she would like to withdraw Amendments #5 and #6 and instead would like to replace it with Amendment #11.

Amendment #11

Proposed by: Claire Moses, Senator-Faculty, Department of women's studies, ARHU

Seconded by: Gay Gullickson, Senator-Faculty, Department of history, ARHU

Section: Part 2: Strategic Initiatives: General Education

Subsection: Amendment to the General Education Section of the Strategic Plan, pages 22 and 23.

What follows is one Amendment with four parts:

- 1) General Education, Vision: **Delete** everything that follows paragraph 1.
- 2) General Education, Goal 1, Strategies A: **Delete** sentences 2 and 3 which read:

"The plan will include specific requirements for numbers and types of courses to be taken and recommendations for the initial set of 2020 Perspectives. It will be designed to accommodate the current credit limits of existing baccalaureate programs."

3) General Education, Goal 1, Strategies B, bullet #2: **Delete** the phrase “three-dimensional framework,” and replace it with “program.”

The section currently reads: “An inventory of existing courses with regard to how they may fit, or might be modified to fit, within the new three-dimensional framework.”

With the proposed Amendment, the section will read: “An inventory of existing courses with regard to how they may fit, or might be modified to fit, within the new program.”

4) General Education, Goal 1, Strategies E, sentence 2: **Delete** the phrase “maintaining the evolving list of 2020 topics and”

The sentence currently reads: Duties will include maintaining the evolving list of 2020 topics and approving individual courses and their categorizations.

With the proposed Amendment, the sentence will read: “Duties will include approving individual courses and their categorizations.”

Submitted Rationale: “The proposed Amendment does not preclude the creation of a General Education program that follows the specifics currently laid out in the Strategic Plan; it indicates neither approval nor disapproval of the ‘three dimensions.’ It merely postpones approval of the specifics until the General Education task force has completed its work and reported to the Senate. The Amendment asks only that we consider the new program in its entirety rather than adopt elements piecemeal.”

Senator Moses, Women’s Studies then described the Amendment. Senator Gullickson, History seconded the motion and stated that she did not think it was appropriate for the Strategic Plan to identify some but not all of the details of the new plan without the Senate’s ability to look at the entire plan and to thoroughly read and discuss it.

Chair Montgomery opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Cadou, Aerospace Engineering introduced Jim Wallace, faculty Member in Engineering and the Director of the Gemstone/Engineering program and Member of the Pease Committee to speak on his behalf. Prof. Wallace urged the Senate to reject this Amendment. He stated that, if accepted, this amendment would negate the framework that was formulated by the Subcommittee of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee.

Betsy Beise, Physics and Member of Strategic Planning Committee stated that she chaired this Subcommittee and they were charged with providing a

framework within which to move forward not to reproduce the Pease report or produce a fully-fleshed out plan. They focused on the needs of students, their huge diversity of interests, majors and range of experience. Dr. Beise's comments exceeded the maximum amount of time allowed for discussion and therefore were stopped but she urged the Senate to reject the Amendment.

Senator Momen, Department of Environmental Science and Technology gave the floor to Prof. Assad, School of Business. Dr. Assad stated that he was also on the Committee for the CORE initiative and said it was their intention to initiate change and serve students. He also stated that Amendment 11 will gut the main thrust of the Committee's recommendations and make them completely in-operational as an invitation to change.

Ira Chinoy, Journalism and Member of the planning Committee stated he was here to urge the Senate to reject the Amendment. He stated that what he liked about the proposal is that it is bold and gutsy and could make an undergraduate education at Maryland distinctive and again urged the Senate to reject the Amendment.

Drew Baden, Chair of Physics Department and Member of the Strategic Planning Committee stated that Amendment 11 tries to water down this area of the plan. He expressed that students should be exposed to different kinds of thinking which is the crux of the 20/20 perspective and urged Senate to reject the Amendment.

Chair Montgomery noted that we are 11 minutes into the 20 minutes allowed for discussion on this Amendment.

Senator Grossman, English supported the Amendment because he believes it delays substantive arguments about CORE courses and believes it is a waste of resources to re-write courses to adhere to the 20/20 perspective.

Senator Morales, Undergraduate Student, ARHU, Student Government Association Representative stated that the plan does not have an implementation phase but rather only a development phase. She further stated that the current CORE program does not accomplish what students want when they leave the University.

Senator Morris, Physics stated that he can not criticize the Strategic Plan and that it does a good job of stepping forward from CORE. He fears that this is progress for its own sake so he supports this Amendment.

Senator Unal, Smith School stated that he believes the measure of success for a University is two-fold: how well you advance new knowledge and how well you have impacted your students. He believes the Strategic Plan does a good job

with the first issue but the second issue in the plan is deficient. He urged the Senate to reject the Amendment.

Robert Gold, Dean of the School of Public Health Member of the Strategic Planning Committee. He started by completing Betsy Beise's statement: Amendment 11 has the dangerous consequence of allowing the possibility of doing absolutely nothing. He hoped that we keep the interests of the students front and center and found it disappointing that a professor would not want to spend time re-vamping a course

Senator Moses, Women's Studies re-stated that the genesis of this Amendment was from discussions much like what was heard here but with more diversity of opinion. She stated that the real problem is that we have not seen the complete general education plan. In no way are you voting for or against this framework by voting for the Amendment.

Chair Montgomery announced that the 20 minute time limit for discussion of this Amendment had been reached and that the debate on this topic was closed.

Chair Montgomery called for a formal vote of the Senate to pass the Amendment. The vote was 24 Yes, 77 No, 7 Abstain. **The motion to approve Amendment #11 failed.**

Amendment #7

Proposed by: Clyde P. Kruskal, Faculty Senator, Department of Computer Science

Seconded by: Chau-Wen, Faculty Senator, Department of Computer Science

Section: Part 3: Critical Enablers: Faculty and Staff

Subsection: Part D of Goal 3 of Part 3 on Page 30:

I am proposing the following Amendment to replace:

The Senate will investigate whether there exists a need to establish a policy and mechanism for reducing compensation when performance improvement goals that are set following an unsatisfactory post-tenure review are not subsequently met. Such a policy, if needed, will be developed in cooperation with the Senate, be fair and equitable, and include stringent safeguards to ensure that it is not abused.

Will replace the current statement in the proposed Strategic Plan:

A policy and a fair and equitable mechanism for reducing compensation will be

established for use when performance improvement goals that are set following an unsatisfactory post-tenure review are not subsequently met. The policy will be developed in cooperation with the Senate and will include stringent safeguards to ensure that this mechanism is not abused.

Senator Kruskal, Computer Science then described the Amendment and suggested that the Senate should debate the need for such a policy. He believes that this is a proposal that will eliminate tenure and that is a huge decision. He believes there should be a committee that discusses this, considers the need for such a policy, and looks at what peer institutions do. He would like to discuss this at a later time with a Committee that can look at things slowly.

Senator Chau-Wen, Computer Science seconded the motion

Kay Bartol, Smith School and Member of the planning Committee stated that she would like to argue against the Amendment because the need for a policy on salary reduction in conjunction with a post-review process is something that she wishes was not needed but sometimes there are faculty Members who do not carry-out his or her responsibilities. We undermine tenure by doing nothing. She respectfully asked the Senate to vote against this Amendment.

Herb Rabin, Acting Dean of Engineering introduced Vince Brannigan. Brannigan believes this provision in the plan is suicidal and stated that the state legislature will deal with the problems of faculty in departments they do not like, or fields they do not like, by chopping salaries.

Darryll Pines, Chair of Aerospace Engineering and Member of planning Committee stated that his department is small and very good but if there are a few underperforming faculty (even after the post-tenure review), the chair has very few incentives to entice the faculty member into good behavior. As a department chair, he urges the Senate to reject the Amendment.

Ann Wylie, Member of Strategic Planning Steering Committee, Assistant President and Chief of Staff stated that she has been on the faculty for a long time and noted that a small number of faculty cease to care about their responsibilities at the University and do not honor tenure. She believes the best way to protect tenure is to develop a policy that has real consequences for those who blatantly disregard their obligations and rely on tenured status to collect a salary that they have not earned.

Elizabeth Loizeaux, English, ARHU and Strategic Planning Committee stated that when this was considered one of the issues raised was that the policy for post-tenure review had not been amended in 10 years, and that the Committee received several requests for a means to help in such situations. She urged the Senate to reject the Amendment because it will slow down the process of putting

a tool in the hands of units to encourage and compel faculty who are not pulling their own weight.

Andrew Freidsen, Ex-Officio SGA urged the Senate to reject the Amendment for the students. He believes that this policy protects students.

Ed Montgomery, Dean of BSOS urged the Senate to reject Amendment. He stated that we need a system that allows us to address those rare instances. He stated that the University of Minnesota has a successful system with safeguards. He believes a system which is measured, allows for appeals and allows for due process is a measured response to instances where someone is abusing the system.

Senator Levermore, Mathematics stated that he was once part of a process at the University of Arizona where tenure was removed from a faculty Member who was underperforming. He believes that if it works at peer institutions it can work here but the concern that he has is tying the process to salary. He stated that he supports the Amendment so that the policy can be re-examined.

Steve Halperin, Dean of CMPS stated that he is against the Amendment. He believes that we will see a higher rate of success with colleagues who do not teach well nor participate in scholarly work. That is not acceptable. He believes that adopting the plan will make it clear to the legislature that we do take very seriously that faculty actually do their jobs.

Irv Goldstein, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Member of the planning Committee stated that he spent a lot of years as an administrator and stated that one of the most frustrating parts of his job was post-tenure review. He stated that the state legislature would worry a lot less about tenure if we took these types of reviews seriously.

Senator Falvey, Chemistry and Biochemistry stated that he is in favor of the Amendment because he was on the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee that created a policy which allows tenured faculty to be suspended for a year for disciplinary infractions. He thinks we should apply that policy to solve the problem instead of creating another mechanism.

Senator Unal, Smith school stated that he is concerned about the process. We should respect faculty governance and get feedback from faculty.

Senator Kruskal, Department of Computer Science stated that we will weaken tenure and we will reduce our ability to attract new faculty.

Robert Gold, Dean of the School of Public Health stated that this is not the first time this issue has been raised and finds it hard to believe that this is the first time the issue has come up.

Chair Montgomery announced that the 20 minute limit for discussion of this Amendment had been reached and the debate is closed on this topic.

Chair Montgomery called for a formal vote of the Senate to pass the Amendment. The vote was 31 Yes, 55 No, 9 Abstain. **The motion to approve Amendment #7 failed.**

Amendment #10

Proposed by: Boden Sandstrom, Senator-Full-Time Lecturer, School of Music
Seconded by: Bradford Gowen, Senator- Faculty, School of Music

Section: Part 3: Critical Enablers, Faculty and Staff

Subsection: "Strategies," Section A, paragraph 5, page 29

Replace the sentence that now reads, "The University will develop hiring and retention inducements such as housing support, partner benefits, day care, and assistance in finding employment for partners and spouses, including support for dual hires where appropriate."

With a sentence that reads. "The University will develop hiring and retention inducements such as housing support, domestic partner benefits (including health insurance), day care, and assistance in finding employment for domestic partners and spouses, including support for dual hires where appropriate."

Submitted Rationale: "In order to attract and retain the very best faculty the University needs to offer the same benefits to everyone and not discriminate against a segment of the population. There are cases of first choice faculty choosing to go elsewhere or other universities successfully recruiting our faculty away because we do not offer domestic partner benefits to LGTB. Granting equal rights and protecting people based on gender identity and expression is becoming increasingly salient for some highly talented students. Our failure to do so already hinders recruitment and will grow in importance as most of the top universities offer these protections and benefits. Support for full domestic partner benefits should be clearly addressed in the Strategic Plan."

Senator Sandstrom then described and read the rationale for the Amendment. She stated that in 2006 campus based benefits were given but not full benefits.

Senator Gowen, Music seconded the motion.

Vic Korenman, Member of the Strategic Planning Committee stated that on behalf of the Committee he was happy to agree to this Amendment.

Chair Montgomery called for a formal vote of the Senate to pass the Amendment.
The motion to approve Amendment #10 passed.

Amendment #14

Proposed by: Patrick Perfetto, Senator-Exempt Staff

Seconded by: Linda Dalo, Senator-Non-Exempt Staff

Section: Part 3: Critical Enablers

Subsection: Infrastructure and Academic Support-Goal 1 pg. 31

Delete **Goal 1** and replace it with:

"GOAL 1. The University will become a model for environmental stewardship and sustainability. We will substantially reduce the use of energy, water, materials, and natural resources. Greenhouse gas emissions will be substantially reduced with concurrent advancement towards the goal of carbon neutrality."

Insert related strategy:

"C. With the Office of Sustainability as coordinator, the University will strive to reduce, reuse, and recycle, as appropriate, water, paper, food, and other resources consumed on the campus."

Senator Perfetto, Conferences and Visitor Services then described the Amendment and introduced R, Scott Lupin, Associate Director, VPAA-Environmental Safety.

Senator Dalo, College of Chemical and Life Sciences seconded the motion.

Scott Lupin thanked the Committee for incorporating sustainability and climate change issues into the Strategic Plan. He stated that he has discussed this Amendment with various Committees/groups on campus and they are supportive of it. He believes that it is important to understand that the University has committed itself to a path of great environmental sustainability and stewardship. He believes sustainability is much broader and involves all aspects of our environmental footprint. So, we must properly manage our natural resources on and around campus as well as consumption of natural resources. He believes that this Amendment will clarify the intent.

Vic Korenman, Member of the Strategic Planning Committee stated that on behalf of the Committee he was happy to agree to this Amendment.

Chair Montgomery called for a formal vote of the Senate to pass the Amendment. The vote was Majority Yes, 0 No, 1 Abstain. **The motion to approve Amendment #14 passed.**

Chair Montgomery stated that the time was 4:45 p.m. and proposed that the meeting be extended to 5:30pm if necessary in order to vote on the entire Plan as a whole. There were no objections.

Chair Montgomery announced that Amendments #1 and #2 would be discussed together, due to their interrelationship, but would be voted on separately, and Amendments #3 and #4 would be discussed together, due to their interrelationship, but would be voted on separately, if there were no objections. No objections were heard, and the discussion proceeded on Amendments #1 and #2.

Amendment #1

Offered by: Marshall Grossman, Faculty Senator, Department of English, ARHU.
Seconded by: Gay L. Gullickson, Faculty Senator, Department of History, ARHU

Section: Part 3: Critical Enablers: Resource Allocation and Administrative Efficiency

Subsection: Goal 1 Strategies

Delete:

The University will establish a budgetary process A. that reallocates an amount approximately equal to 2% of the University's state supported operating funds (2% is about \$16M in the 2008 budget) every year. Of the retained resources, half will be held by the Provost for redistribution and half will be reallocated within the division or college from which it derives. Reallocations will be aligned with priorities of the Strategic Plan, with overall coordination by the Provost.

Senator Grossman, English then described both Amendments and rationales for each and stated that he likes the flexibility but is concerned about centralizing the process.

Senator Gullickson, History seconded both motions.

Amendment #2

Offered by: Marshall Grossman, Faculty Senator, Department of English, ARHU.
Seconded by: Gay L. Gullickson, Faculty Senator, Department of History, ARHU

Section: In the Plan: Part 3 Critical Enablers: Resource Allocation
and Administrative Efficiency

Subsection: Goal 1 Strategies, B.

Delete:

For all tenured faculty separations and retirements, half the position and associated state salary will revert to the Provost's Office for allocation. These reversions will count towards the college's share within the reallocation process. This rule will be administered [in] such a way that it does not unduly influence decisions concerning faculty retirement.

Submitted Rationale: "These Amendments leave intact the over-all goals and criteria for reallocation of resources, but they remove language that 1. Mandates specific numbers across the University and centralizes budgetary authority. Reallocation of funds goes on in the University all the time and it has not been adequately established that centralized procedures will produce better results than the processes of negotiation and renegotiation under which we now operate. We have been extremely successful in improving the quality of our institution and this success mandates that we ought to be conservative in changing the procedures that have served us well."

Senator Grossman described both of the amendments and the rationale, and he stated that he likes the flexibility but is concerned about centralizing the process.

Ann Wylie, Member of Strategic Planning Steering Committee, Assistant President and Chief of Staff stated that we can not just look at tuition for resources necessary to implement this plan. Without a commitment to reallocate resources from within, we will not be successful in increasing real funding from the state. She urged the Senate to reject Amendments 1-4.

Irv Goldstein, Member of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, Vice Chancellor stated that this type of thing happens often and is a regular process. He further stated that we should allow the Provost to administer this policy.

Jeffrey Huskamp, Member of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, Vice President and Chief Information Officer urged the Senate to reject the Amendments for the following reasons: agility to take advantage of opportunities, need to give the Provost the flexibility to guarantee agility; resources should be aligned with the Strategic Plan by centralizing resources; centralization gives a larger view of the operation and makes strategic investments. If we do not do

our part, we cannot call on the state to do its part. We can not make more progress without reallocation.

Nariman Farvardin, Chair of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost strongly urged the Senate to reject Amendments one through four. He stated that there was a strong linkage between the plan's proposed initiatives and targets and the availability of resources to support them, the proposed resource allocation process and amounts are carefully developed to support the implementation of this Plan to serve the needs of our students and programs over the next decade.

Chair-Elect Holum indicated that the Provost's time was up.

Edward Montgomery, Dean BSOS stated that resources should be matched with the priorities of the University.

Devin Ellis, Graduate Student and Member of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee stated that the Amendment hinders the ability of the plan to be implemented. He further stated that in order to become a world-class institution if you remove the ability of people who have to make the tough decisions to make them. He urged the Senate strongly to reject the Amendment.

Charles Caramello, Dean of Graduate School stated that the Plan imagines real competitive stipends for graduate students which will allow us to compete for the best students and for them to live decently. The funds for this cannot come from soft funds so he urged the Senate to reject the Amendments.

Brodie Remington, VP and Member of Strategic Planning Steering Committee, Vice President for University Relations stated that without meaningful resource allocation, we will lose leverage with the Board of Regents, the Governor and the State legislature. State funding is scarce, and they are not likely to help us unless they are convinced that we are partners in the 'heavy-lifting' to advance the University. Donors expect institutions seeking their support to demonstrate their own commitment to new initiatives. Charity has disappeared and has been replaced by "investment philanthropy". He urged the Senate to reject the Amendments.

James Harris, Dean ARHU stated that we should reject the Amendments. He believes that we need to find a way to make better use of our resources but also leverage other resources. There is a lot more gold to be found at the state capitol than the pockets of the graduates. If we are going to move forward, we need to reject the Amendments.

Stephen Halperin, Dean CMPS stated that the Senate should reject Amendments one through four. Even though CMPS may get hit by this part of

the plan, he still believes that some centralization is necessary if we are going to invest the small amount of funds to make this a better place. That may mean that some colleges get a reduction in base budget but urged Senate to trust the leadership.

Senator Schumacher, Architecture stated that he is against the Amendment.

Chair Montgomery called for a formal vote of the Senate to pass the Amendment #1. The vote was 5 Yes, Majority No, 5 Abstain. **The motion to approve Amendment #1 failed.**

Chair Montgomery called for a formal vote of the Senate on Amendment #2. The vote was 6 Yes, Majority No, 6 Abstain. **The motion to approve Amendment #2 failed.**

As Chair Montgomery announced previously, Amendments #3 and #4 would be discussed together, but would be voted on separately.

Amendment #3

Proposed by: Maynard Mack, Jr., Senator-Faculty, English

Seconded by: John Pease, Senator-Faculty, Sociology

Section: Part 3: Critical Enablers: Resource Allocation and Administrative Efficiency p. 33.

Subsection: Strategy A (page 33):

1) The reallocation (Strategy A) be reduced by half and would read, "1% of the University's state-supported operating funds,"

Amendment #4

Proposed by: Maynard Mack, Jr., Senator-Faculty, English

Seconded by: John Pease, Senator-Faculty, Sociology

Section: Part 3: Critical Enablers: Resource Allocation and Administrative Efficiency page 33.

Subsection: Strategy B (page 33)

2) The reversion (Strategy B) is reduced by half, "one quarter of vacated lines and one quarter of the associated state salary."*

Senator Mack, English then described Amendments #3 and #4. He stated that this reduction would drastically affect small departments poor in research funds. He believes the department knows more what to do with funds.

Senator Pease, Sociology seconded the motions.

Devin Ellis, Member of Strategic Planning Steering Committee stated that there is a misperception that the desire to have central input in allocations of resources means that the provost will unilaterally make the decisions but that is not the case. He asked the Senate to please oppose Amendments #3 and #4.

Melvin Bernstein, Member of Strategic Planning Steering Committee, Vice President for Research stated that resource allocations will be done in conjunction with deans and department chairs. He urged the Senate to reject Amendments 3 and 4.

Ann Wylie, Member of Strategic Planning Steering Committee, Assistant President and Chief of Staff stated that 2% is a strong statement about our commitment to looking to a different source of revenue to make the University move forward. She urged the Senate to vote against Amendments 3 and 4.

Nariman Farvardin, Chair of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost stated that there is a direct linkage between the construct of the Strategic Plan and the way they have devised the resources that would support it. He clarified that there is no intention of developing a process where on an annual basis resources will move from units and go to a central bank account. The idea is to allow the resources to move around so that the resources and priorities will align.

Chair Montgomery called for a formal vote of the Senate on the Amendment #3. The vote was 11 Yes, Majority No, 1 Abstain. **The motion to approve Amendment #3 failed.**

Chair Montgomery called for a formal vote of the Senate on Amendment #4. The vote was 12 Yes, Majority No, 4 Abstain. **The motion to approve Amendment #4 failed.**

Chair Montgomery announced that the time was 5:18pm and that the vote on the entire Plan was still needed. He requested Amendments from the floor.

Amendment #15

Proposed by: Dave Levermore, Senator-Faculty, Mathematics
Seconded by: Gay Gullickson, Senator-Faculty, History

Section: Part 1: Institutional Priorities
Subsection: Graduate Education, Goal 1 p. 13

Wording change for Goal 1:

Current Wording: "The University will have graduate and professional programs of the highest quality, characterized by high completion rates, a short time to degree, outstanding accomplishments by their students, appropriate and prestigious placements upon graduation and Ph.D. programs that **normally require full-time fully-funded students.**"

The last phrase is re-worded to read:" and Ph.D. programs that **strive to have fully-funded full-time students.**"

Senator Levermore, Mathematics then described the Amendment and Gay Gullickson, History seconded the motion.

Ann Wylie, Member of Strategic Planning Steering Committee, Assistant President and Chief of Staff stated that the Committee had no objection to this Amendment.

Chair Montgomery called for a formal vote of the Senate on Amendment #15.
The motion to approve Amendment #15 passed unanimously.

Senator Laura Johnson, Engineering stated that she would like to bring Amendment #5 back to the floor.

Senator Gullickson, History agreed with the suggestion and as the original Senator to propose Amendment #5, she brought Amendment #5 back to the floor for consideration by the Senate, with the original Senator, Claire Moses (Senator-Faculty, Women's Studies), again seconding the motion.

Amendment #5

Proposed by: Gay Gullickson, Senator-Faculty, Department of History, ARHU
Seconded by: Claire Moses, Senator-Faculty, Department of Women's Studies, ARHU

Section: Part 2: Strategic Initiatives: General Education, "Vision,"
Subsection: page 22, paragraph 2, next to last sentence

Replace the sentence that now reads, "In this new structure, each course will contain characteristics of all three of these dimensions,"

With a sentence that reads "In this new structure, courses will contain one of more of these three dimensions."

Senator Laura Johnson, Engineering stated that she does not want to limit the University to ensuring that all courses have all 3 dimensions. She thinks they should have one or more of the dimensions as a minimum requirement.

Ira Chinoy, Member of Strategic Planning Steering Committee stated that this Amendment will gut the proposal for general education. He urged the Senate to reject the Amendment.

Kathy McAdams, Member of Strategic Planning Steering Committee, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies urged the Senate to trust the general education Committee to appropriately select and classify the courses.

Betsy Beise, Member of Strategic Planning Steering Committee stated that the choice of one dimension would have no disciplinary content so that is not what we intend.

Senator Gullickson, History stated that it was not her intention to destroy the proposal but rather to add a period for reflection and some flexibility. We should not commit ourselves to every course having all three dimensions without having a discussion of the three dimensions.

Chair Montgomery called for a formal vote of the Senate on Amendment #5. The vote was 17 Yes, Majority No and 8 Abstain. **The motion to approve Amendment #5 failed.**

Chair Montgomery asked if there were any other Amendments.

Senator Doherty, Classics made a motion for a paper ballot on the final vote to approve the Strategic Plan as a whole as amended so there would be tangible record of the vote.

Senator Mack, English seconded the motion.

Chair Montgomery informed the Senate that this motion, as a procedural motion, is not debatable and called for a formal vote on the motion. The vote was 18 Yes, Majority No, and 0 Abstentions. **The motion for a paper ballot failed.**

Chair Montgomery called for a formal vote to approve the Strategic Plan as amended. The vote was 68 Yes, 5 No, 3 Abstain. **The motion to approve the Strategic Plan as amended is approved by the Senate.**

Chair Montgomery introduced President Mote to address the Senate.

Dr. Mote stated that this was a remarkable effort. He thanked the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, Provost, Chair Montgomery, the Senate and everyone involved. He said it was a huge effort of everyone who studied it and who made comments. He was impressed at everyone's insightful remarks, preparation, comments etc. He said it was a remarkable experience in governance and planning. He believes that there has been no better Senate meeting that he has ever attended. He further stated that we should be proud of this milestone, should not be fearful, but rather should be inspired by the opportunities. He called on everyone to be engaged in the process to the end. He thanked everyone for their support and gave his vote of appreciation for all of the efforts on all sides of the issues.

New Business

Hearing no further business, Senate Chair Montgomery adjourned the meeting at 5:47 p.m.