



**Review of the University of Maryland Plan of Organization for Shared Governance  
(Senate Document #21-22-30)  
Plan of Organization Review Committee (PORC) | Chair: Will Reed**

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and Senate Chair Williams request that the Plan of Organization Review Committee (PORC) review the [Plan of Organization for Shared Governance at the University of Maryland](#) and the associated [Bylaws of the University Senate at the University of Maryland](#).

Specifically, PORC should review the Senate's apportionment, review of the Senate Councils, and various procedural issues that have arisen during Senate operations since the last revision of the Plan of Organization. The SEC and Senate Chair Newman amended the charge to include PORC reviewing the relationship between the Senate and the University Systems Councils, the relationship between student government organizations and the Senate and its committees, and the status of the Senate Special Committee on University Finance.

1. Review the Review of the University of Maryland Plan of Organization ([Senate Document# 14-15-19](#)).
2. Review previous revisions to the Senate Bylaws ([Senate Document# 14-15-20](#)) (Bylaws).

**Review of Senate Apportionment:**

3. Review the Apportionment of the University Senate performed in 2015 ([Senate Document# 14-15-35](#)).
4. Review the Apportionment of the University Senate performed in 2020 ([Senate Document# 19-20-37](#)).
5. Consult with the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA) on institutional data regarding population trends of the various constituent groups on campus.
6. Consult with the Office of Faculty Affairs on faculty population trends and other issues related to representation of faculty in shared governance.
7. Consider principles associated with Senate proportional representation and its apportionment:
  - a. The overall percentage of tenured/tenure-track faculty in relation to other constituencies on the Senate;
  - b. The balance of representation of faculty between tenured/tenure-track faculty and professional track faculty;
  - c. The overall size of the Senate and whether it should be capped; and

- d. The apportionment process and the associated timelines related to apportionment including the impact of a delay to a standard Plan review cycle.
8. If appropriate, recommend whether revisions should be made to the Senate's constituency-based representation and its apportionment.

**Review of University Councils:**

- 9. Review Article 8.6 in the Plan of Organization and Articles 8 and 9 and Appendices 1-3 of the Senate Bylaws.
- 10. Consult with the chairs of the University Councils and the administrative unit heads to whom they report.
- 11. Consider shared governance principles utilized by the University Councils:
  - a. The effective utilization of these councils in engaging with both the administrative unit head and the Senate.
  - b. The councils' practices in leveraging standing bodies such as working groups or subcommittees; and
  - c. The councils' practices in incorporating constituency-based feedback into their review processes, especially when considering new standards and administrative policies that do not typically undergo a Senate review. (see attached IT Proposal).
  - d. How the above principles (a-c) are incorporated into the Bylaws and operations of the Council.
- 12. If appropriate, recommend whether each of the three councils should be modified based on the provisions in article 8.7a of the Senate Bylaws.

**Review of University System Councils:**

- 13. Review of University Systems Councils Bylaws:
  - a. CUSF-  
[https://www.usmd.edu/usm/workgroups/SystemFaculty/CUSF\\_Bylaws\\_v1804.pdf](https://www.usmd.edu/usm/workgroups/SystemFaculty/CUSF_Bylaws_v1804.pdf)
  - b. CUSS-<https://www.usmd.edu/usm/workgroups/SystemStaff/bylaws.html>
- 14. Review of Bylaws of the University Senate, Appendix 5 (CUSF) and Appendix 6 (CUSS)
- 15. Consult with CUSF and CUSS chairs.
- 16. Consult with current and former CUSF and CUSS council members.
- 17. Consider the advantages and disadvantages of the CUSF and CUSS representatives having prior experience serving on either a Senate committee or University Council.

18. Consider whether the CUSF and CUSS representatives should be required to have prior experience on a Senate committee or University Council to ensure an understanding of University administrative operations and shared governance.
19. Review election data for trends and how often a person with no Senate experience served on CUSF or CUSS.
20. Consider the impact on the candidacy pool if CUSF/CUSS representatives are required to have prior Senate committee or University Council experience.
21. Review the advantages and disadvantages of incorporating the practice of having the primary members for both CUSF and CUSS designate which primary member will serve as a non-voting ex-officio at SEC meetings and designate an alternative backup ex-officio member for each of the councils at the end of the elections cycle.
22. Review the advantages or disadvantages of the council ex-officio not being a serving member on the SEC to maintain non-voting status vs. if the person is already serving on the SEC, can they also be the council's non-voting ex-officio representative.

**Review of Shared Governance Practices:**

23. Consider principles associated with Senate eligibility regarding:
  - a. Graduate students employed in a C1 hourly position or as junior lecturers;
  - b. LTSC undergraduate student Senators who declare a major during their term and undergraduate student Senators who change majors during their term;
  - c. Full and part-time Assistant Coaches;
  - d. Part-time staff;
  - e. The definition of "full term" for purposes of calculating eligibility for re-election; and
  - f. Faculty with joint appointments of equal time (50/50).
24. Consider principles associated with college/unit plan of organizations and associated review processes:
  - a. Differentiation between College/School-level Plans and Department/Program-level Plans;
  - b. The eligibility of students and staff to vote on a college/school/unit Plan and of students to review a Plan;
  - c. The process for out-of-cycle Plan reviews;
  - d. The inclusion of student and staff Senator election information in unit Plans when those elections are handled by the Senate Office;
  - e. The impact of noncompliance with Plan review requirements on Senate representation;

- f. The impact of revisions to the University Plan on previously-approved unit-level Plans of Organization; and
- g. The approval authority for unit-level plans.
- h. The authority over and criteria for articles of recall of officers; and
- i. The responsibilities and authority over impeachment articles of Officers.

25. Consider principles associated with shared governance:

- a. The authority over and requirements for drafting, reviewing, and approving expulsion petitions;
- b. The authority over impeachment articles;
- c. The Past Chair's role on the SEC;
- d. The Parliamentarian's ability to retain voting privileges if also an elected Senator; and
- e. Eligibility requirements for elected slates where there are no available representatives of a specific constituency.

26. Consider clarifying language in the Plan and Bylaws regarding:

- a. The use of the term "unit" throughout but also terms such as "academic unit" and "voting unit";
- b. Voting procedures and permissible voting methods for Senate meetings in the Bylaws;
- c. The requirement that colleges/schools have Faculty Advisory Councils (FACs); and
- d. Any inconsistencies in the Plan and Bylaws or between the two documents.

27. Consider the principles associated with student government organizations being represented in the Senate and on its committees.

- a. Consider the responsibilities of student government organizations' representation and student constituency representation.
- b. Consider the roles and responsibilities of student government organizations' representation in the Senate and on its committees as regular and ex-officio members.

### **Review of Special Committee on University Finance**

28. Review Article 7 Special Committee on University Finance (SCUF) of the Bylaws.

29. Review final report from SCUF.

30. Consult with the Chair of the SCUF.
31. Consult with the Vice President for Finance and Chief Financial Officer.
32. Consult with the Vice President and Chief Administrative Officer.
33. Consider whether SCUF is an effective means of:
  - a. Enhancing the Senate's and its committees' understanding of the fiscal issues the University faces to assist the Senate with making informed recommendations;
  - b. Facilitating open and transparent communication about the University's budgeting process and educating the campus community on the complexities of how campus resources are allocated and used; and
  - c. Providing a means to communicate to University administrators the perspectives of the campus community on budgetary and fiscal matters.
34. Consider whether the SCUF should be re-established as a Standing Committee (Bylaws, 5.1 - 5.6) or a Special Committee (Bylaws, 5.9).
35. Consider the relationship between a reestablished SCUF and the Vice President for Finance & Chief Financial Officer, the University Budget Advisory Committee, and the University's financial units and processes.
36. Consider the membership composition and selection and replacement processes for a reestablished SCUF, including whether faculty representation should be by College and School.
37. If appropriate, review recommendations for the re-establishment of the SCUF with the Senate Parliamentarian for guidance on proposed revisions to the Bylaws.
38. If appropriate, recommend whether the Plan of Organization for Shared Governance at the University of Maryland and/or the Bylaws of the University Senate at the University of Maryland should be revised.

We ask that you submit a report to the Senate Office no later than **November 8, 2023**. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Veronica Marin in the Senate Office at [senateadmin@umd.edu](mailto:senateadmin@umd.edu).