



1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the November 6, 2024 Senate Minutes (Action)
3. Report of the Chair
4. Special Order  
Darryll J. Pines  
President of the University of Maryland, College Park  
*State of the Campus Address*
5. Special Order  
Maureen Kotlas  
Executive Director, Department of Environmental Safety, Security, and Risk  
*Climate Action Plan 3.0*
6. Approval of the Nominations Committee Slate (Senate Document #24-25-19) (Action)
7. Continued Business: Resolution in Support of Democratic Attempts to Obtain Graduate Worker Collective Bargaining Rights (Action)
8. New Business
9. Adjournment



## **CALL TO ORDER**

---

Chair Sly called the meeting to order at 3:18 p.m.

## **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES, OCTOBER 10, 2024 MEETING**

---

Chair Sly asked if there were any corrections to the minutes of the October 10, 2024, meeting; hearing none, Chair Sly declared the minutes approved as distributed.

## **REPORT OF THE CHAIR**

---

### Procedures and Guidelines

Chair Sly explained the procedures and guidelines of the meeting.

### Senate Office Staffing Updates

Chair Sly announced that the University Senate Office has completed the initial review for the Assistant Director position and will conduct in person interviews, with Senate Leadership joining for the final selection round.

### Big Ten Academic Alliance Senate Leadership Conference

Chair Sly announced that the University of Maryland will host this year's Big Ten Academic Alliance Senate Leadership Conference starting Thursday, November 7 to Saturday, November 9, 2024. The attendees will meet with the President, the Provost and the University of Maryland's Senate Leadership team.

### December 4, 2024 Senate Meeting Update

Chair Sly announced that the next University Senate Meeting will take place in person at the Hoff Theater in the Adele H. Stamp Student Union. Chair Sly noted that President Darryll J. Pines will present the State of the Campus Address at this meeting.

## **APPROVAL OF THE RESEARCH COUNCIL SLATE (SENATE DOCUMENT #24-25-16) (ACTION)**

---

Chair Sly invited Sarah Dammeyer, Chair of the Committee on Committees and Chair-Elect, to present the Research Council Slate.

Dammeyer began by giving context and background on the slate.

Chair Sly thanked Dammeyer and opened the floor to discussion on the slate.

Senator Hajiaghayi, TTK, CMNS, asked for an explanation of how the slate was created. Director Marin responded that it followed the procedures of shared governance, noting that it was approved by the Committee on Committees on October 21, 2024, after the committee had worked with the Division of Research (VPR) on recruiting volunteers since March 2024.

Dean Rivera, BSOS, mentioned that Melanie Killen, faculty member on the Research Council Slate, was in the College of Education (EDUC), not in the College of Mathematics and Natural Sciences (CMNS). Chair Sly noted the slate would be amended to reflect the correction.

Chair Sly called for a second on the motion. The motion was seconded. Chair Sly opened the floor to further discussion on the motion. Hearing none, Chair Sly called for a vote on the motion to approve the Research Council Slate as amended. The results were 84 in favor, 4 opposed, and 14 abstained. **The Senate votes in favor of approving the Research Council Slate (Senate Document #24-25-16) as amended for the 2024-2025 academic year.**

### **PCC PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A PH.D. IN BIOSTATISTICS (SENATE DOCUMENT #24-25-13) (ACTION)**

---

Chair Sly invited Wendy Stickle, Chair of the Programs, Curricula and Courses (PCC) Committee to present the proposal.

Stickle provided background and information on the proposal.

Chair Sly thanked Stickle and opened the floor for discussion on the proposal.

Senator Dyer, TTK, SPHL, highlighted the importance of establishing a PhD program specifically in biostatistics within the School of Public Health. Currently, biostatistics and epidemiology are combined into one department with a shared tenure home. This contrasts with top-tier institutions, where biostatistics is often an independent department. The recent formation of a separate department for the Maryland Institute for Applied Environmental Health serves as a precedent. Establishing a dedicated biostatistics PhD program would greatly benefit the University System of Maryland, UMD, and the School of Public Health.

Chair Sly asked for further comments. Hearing none, Chair Sly called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 104 in favor, 2 opposed, and 4 abstained. **The Senate votes in favor of establishing a PhD in Biostatistics (Senate Document #24-25-13).**

### **PCC PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A MASTER OF SCIENCE IN BIOSTATISTICS (SENATE DOCUMENT #24-25-14) (ACTION)**

---

Chair Sly invited Wendy Stickle, Chair of the Programs, Curricula and Courses (PCC) Committee to present the proposal.

Stickle provided background and information on the proposal.

Chair Sly thanked Stickle and opened the floor for discussion on the proposal.

Senator Dyer, TTK, SPHL, emphasized the nationwide shortage of biostatisticians in public health, highlighting a projected high job growth rate in this field, with up to 10,000 jobs added annually through 2035. A letter of support from the department of mathematics acknowledges this need. Senator Dyer underscored the importance of establishing a Master of Science (MS) program in biostatistics within the department, noting that it provides a stronger focus on applied biostatistical methods than a Master of Public Health (MPH). This program would help address the pipeline shortage and better prepare students entering the field at the master's level.

Senator Hajiaghayi, TTK, CMNS, asked if peer or top-tier institutions offer a master's program, specifically in biostatistics, and inquired whether similar institutions also have dedicated PhD programs in the field.

Senator Dyer responded that top public health schools, including Johns Hopkins University, the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), the University of Michigan, and the University of California, Berkeley, all offer separate MS programs in biostatistics, alongside MPH programs in the field. The MS in biostatistics typically has an applied focus, often requiring a thesis, while the MPH is more theoretical.

Beise added that the Graduate School, led by Dean Stephen Roth, has been ensuring that PhD programs offer reasonable exit paths for students who may choose or need to leave. Most PhD programs have a companion MS program, and this would apply to the proposed biostatistics PhD as well.

Dean Roth confirmed Beise's statement, adding that the Graduate School is actively encouraging all PhD program proposals to include a companion master's degree to provide an exit path for students if needed.

Chair Sly asked for further comments. Hearing none, Chair Sly called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 113 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstained. **The Senate votes in favor of establishing a Master of Science in Biostatistics (Senate Document #24-25-14).**

## **EDI REPORT: REVIEW OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON THREATENING AND INTIMIDATING CONDUCT (SENATE DOCUMENT #19-20-33) (INFORMATION)**

---

Chair Sly provided information and background on the report from the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Committee.

Chair Sly opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Keshavarz-Karamustafa, TTK, ARHU, inquired about communication between the team working on the proposal and the Faculty Grievance Policy under review by the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), suggesting potential synergy between the two reviews.

Director Marin clarified that the two items were handled separately, as the initial review occurred during the 2019-2020 academic year, whereas the Faculty Grievance Policy review was assigned to the Senate this academic year. Each committee's charge specified independent reviews with no required consultations, resulting in no overlap or coordination.

Senator Herf, Emeritus, ARHU, expressed concern that concluding the review of the policy on threatening and intimidating conduct might appear dismissive given recent campus events. Herf requested clarification from committee members supporting closure, stating that the timing is inopportune.

Senator Wall, Non-Exempt, emphasized the importance of a defined plan before concluding the review, warning that closure without a clear course of action risks indefinite delay. Wall recommended ensuring actionable next steps are established before finalizing the matter.

Chair Sly directed senators to the shared language, noting that further review is suggested and that the committee's work is not concluded.

Senator Herf asked if the language in the document could be strengthened to explicitly state that the committee will continue reviewing these issues.

Director Marin reiterated that the item is informational and not up for a vote. Proposals for further review, including those by Senator Herf, may be submitted to the University Senate Office with recommendations to assign the matter to the EDI Committee. Director Marin noted that a special committee for policy review is expected to convene in the spring for a holistic assessment of institutional policies.

Senator Miller, PTK, CMNS, sought clarification on whether the Senate would vote on a recommendation for a charge, as indicated in the paperwork, or if it was informational. Chair Sly confirmed that it was an informational item, attributing discrepancies in the paperwork to an oversight.

Senator Wall inquired about measures to ensure continued consideration of the matter if it remains open, expressing concern about simplifying language with the intent of later re-proposal.

Chair Sly responded that the SEC had already voted to close the item but assured that the EDI Committee will reassess its goals and charges.

Chair Sly announced the closure of the discussion and transitioned to the next agenda item.

## **SPECIAL ORDER**

---

**John Bertot**

**Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs at the University of Maryland**

***Visiting Faculty Title Use Report***

Chair Sly introduced Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, John Bertot, to provide a report on title use of visiting faculty at the University of Maryland.

Bertot began by thanking the Senate for the opportunity to present, noting the goal of sharing data and background regarding the visiting faculty title, particularly for instructional faculty positions, and offering insights based on an analysis conducted in spring 2024.

Bertot explained that the presentation was prompted by concerns raised by the Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA) and the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) about the increasing use of visiting faculty titles, particularly in instructional appointments. Bertot highlighted the definition of instructional professional track (PTK) faculty as outlined in the university's Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) policy, which includes lecturers and clinical faculty.

Bertot referenced a prior Senate review from the 2016–2017 academic year that focused on visiting faculty titles. That review led to an expansion of the definition of visiting faculty titles, allowing appointments for up to three years. After three years, a visiting faculty member must either transition to a regular position through a search and selection process or leave the institution.

Bertot described the updated review conducted by his office in spring 2024, which focused on the growing use of visiting faculty titles. Data was collected from two time points: spring 2020 and spring 2024. The number of individuals holding visiting titles increased from 132 in 2020 to 548 in 2024, though by fall 2024, the number had decreased slightly to 479. Bertot noted a shift in these appointments: in 2020, most visiting appointments were paid, whereas by 2024, the majority were unpaid. This shift reflected broader campus trends, with some units, such as the College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences (CMNS), using the visiting title for a significant proportion of faculty appointments.

Bertot outlined various reasons for using visiting titles, including allowing for short-term appointments, expediting the hiring process for tenured and professional track faculty, and creating affiliations with external organizations or agencies for research purposes. Bertot emphasized that many visiting faculty appointments are unpaid, especially for individuals employed elsewhere, such as researchers in government agencies or industry. Bertot also noted that visiting faculty are often hired for specific contracted projects, with some transitioning to non-visiting positions after the project concludes.

Bertot concluded by discussing a new use for visiting titles: probationary instructional faculty appointments. Some units now hire individuals into visiting faculty positions to assess their performance before deciding on a permanent, non-visiting appointment. Bertot suggested that this approach helps streamline the hiring process while ensuring performance expectations are met.

Chair Sly thanked Bertot and opened the floor for questions. Hearing none, Chair Sly moved on to the next agenda item.

## **SPECIAL ORDER**

---

**Stephanie Chang & Dawn Culpepper**  
**Assistant Vice President for Diversity & Inclusion, and**  
**Director of the ADVANCE Program for Inclusive Excellence**  
*UMD Belonging and Community Survey*

Chair Sly invited Stephanie Chang, Assistant Vice President for Diversity & Inclusion, and Dawn Culpepper, Director of the ADVANCE Program for Inclusive Excellence, to present a report on the UMD Belonging and Community Survey that was distributed in Spring 2024.

Chang began with a message of appreciation to the University Senate for the opportunity to share a critical milestone in the UMD Belonging and Community Survey, noting extensive campus support and champions from across the Maryland community. The survey, administered by Rankin Climate, was designed to measure the experiences of students, faculty, and staff in their campus environment. Rankin Climate, recognized for experience facilitating campus climate assessments at over 300 North American colleges and universities, is present to share the survey's results.

Victoria Cabal, Executive Vice President for Strategy and Operations, and Dan Merson, Executive Vice President for Assessment, represented Rankin Climate. Following the presentation, Culpepper explained a plan to outline the next steps, with a brief Q&A to follow, time permitting. Chang and Culpepper, as project co-chairs, expressed gratitude to the campus community for its support and participation, underscoring the survey as a collaborative, campuswide effort.

Merson from Rankin Climate proceeded with an overview of the key findings. Drawing from extensive experience within higher education, Merson introduced the survey methodology, highlighting statistical testing, qualitative analysis, and the combination of quantitative and qualitative insights. The report, prepared for community access, includes only statistically significant results alongside overall descriptive findings. Quantitative measures included campus climate, sense of belonging, mental health, institutional retention intentions, exclusionary conduct, faculty-student interactions, student-staff interactions, and perceived academic success for students. Specific experiences of graduate students and staff, particularly in terms of workplace climate and institutional support, were also explored.

The description of the survey sample included response rates by demographic representation based on gender and racial identity.

Merson continued with a summary of sample response rates, noting that, overall, the samples demonstrated good representation of the population. Merson acknowledged minor differences in tracked categories versus those listed in the survey, particularly in areas such as racial and ethnic identity, where terms like "multiracial" and "missing or unknown" reflect common survey challenges. Moving into the results, Merson reported that the data was analyzed across four primary groups—undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty, and staff—beginning with the general campus climate.

Seventy-eight (78) percent of undergraduate students reported feeling "comfortable" or "very comfortable" with the overall climate. However, Merson emphasized the importance of detail in

understanding group differences in comfort levels. Based on academic literature and past work, individuals' backgrounds, identities, and roles shape unique experiences within an organization. To identify these distinctions, the analysis included multiple statistical tests comparing comfort levels across identity groups, while ensuring participant confidentiality. In cases of low response counts (under five), numbers were masked, or categories were combined to protect privacy.

The analysis identified notable differences based on gender and racial identity among undergraduates. For gender, students identifying as gender expansive reported lower comfort levels with the overall climate compared to men and women, with women also reporting lower comfort than men. Similarly, comfort differences emerged across racial and ethnic identities. Black undergraduates reported lower comfort levels than Asian and white undergraduates, multiracial undergraduates less comfortable than white, and undergraduates in the "small sample" racial and ethnic categories less comfortable than others. Due to limited sample sizes, some groups were combined for this analysis.

For a sense of belonging, similar trends emerged. Gender expansive students and women reported lower belonging scores than men, while among racial and ethnic groups, Black undergraduates reported lower belonging scores than Asian, Hispanic, South Asian, and white undergraduates.

Merson presented findings as follows:

- **Emerging Themes:** Analyses indicate distinct group experiences across racial, ethnic, and first-generation student identities. Notable disparities appeared in perceived academic success for first-generation students but were not significant by gender identity.
- **Faculty and Staff Interactions:** Differences in faculty and staff interactions were notable by racial and ethnic identity. Mental health concerns similarly varied by gender and racial identity.
- **Consideration of Departure:** 18% of undergraduates and 22% of graduate students had considered leaving, primarily due to a lack of belonging. Graduate students additionally cited academic concerns. Reasons to stay included proximity to home, peer connections, and career development.
- **Exclusionary Conduct:** 15% of undergraduates reported exclusionary conduct, primarily related to race, gender, and religion. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict emerged as a specific source of tension.
- **Graduate Student Citizenship Status:** Graduate student experiences varied based on citizenship status, impacting perceived academic success and advisor relationships.
- **Graduate Advisors:** Mixed experiences were reported with graduate advisors, reflecting both supportive and challenging dynamics.

These findings underscore the complexity of campus climate and the varied experiences of the campus population. Further summaries for faculty and staff follow in the same format.

Merson reported the following findings for graduate students, faculty, and staff:



## Graduate Students:

- Reasons for Staying: Career opportunities, faculty and peer connections, student organizations.
- Exclusionary Conduct: 20% reported experiencing it, citing position as the main factor, followed by race, gender, and age.

## Faculty:

- Comfort and Differences: Most faculty felt generally comfortable, though tenured and tenure-track faculty felt less comfortable than non-tenure-track faculty.
- Concerns: 51% considered leaving due to workload, sense of belonging, recruitment to other positions, and salary concerns. Faculty chose to stay for meaningful work, student connections, and colleague relationships.
- Exclusionary Conduct: 24% experienced it, with position as the main factor.

## Staff:

- Comfort and Differences: 75% reported comfort with the climate, but differences arose by gender, race, and position status.
- Concerns: 49% considered leaving due to limited advancement, salary, workload, cost of living, and supervisor relationships. Staff cited benefits, coworker connections, and flexible schedules as reasons for staying.
- Exclusionary Conduct: 21% reported it, primarily related to position, age, and gender.

Across groups, institutional action was identified, highlighting positive contributions, barriers, and suggestions for improvement.

Dawn Culpepper emphasized the importance of action following the survey results and outlined the next steps:

1. Action Planning: Collaborate with key offices across campus, including Academic Affairs (AA), Student Affairs (SA), and University Human Resources (UHR), to interpret survey results and inform action plans.
2. Strategic Deployment: Work with the Provost's Office to integrate survey insights into unit-level plans that align with the university's strategic goals. ODI, in collaboration with the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA), ADVANCE Program for Inclusive Excellence (ADVANCE), and Center for Leadership & Organizational Change (CLOC), will support units in adopting the Action Impact Framework, established during the Thriving Workplace Initiative.
3. Resources and Workshops: Provide unit-level dashboards and facilitate workshops, professional development, and evidence-based resources to help units address climate issues effectively.
4. Access and Timelines:
  - a. Campus Dashboard: Results will be accessible to the campus community with further analysis options available through IRPA and Tableau (CAS login would be required).

- b. Unit-Level Dashboards: Expected in January 2025, with unit administrators designating access. Data will be disaggregated by demographics where sample size permits.
5. Community Engagement: The community is invited to provide feedback at [belonging@umd.edu](mailto:belonging@umd.edu), with updates posted to [belonging.umd.edu](http://belonging.umd.edu).
6. Survey Incentive: "Testudinettes Twist," an ice cream flavor created by student Mallory Haselberger, launched at the Maryland Dairy as part of the survey incentive.

Chair Sly thanked the speakers for their presentation and opened the floor to discussion.

Senator Lloyd, PTK, ARHU, inquired about the absence of specific data on people with disabilities, noting they are the largest minority group in the U.S., and expressed concern that this demographic was not addressed in the survey breakdown. Additionally, Lloyd questioned why the survey included limited references to professional track (PTK) faculty, one of the largest faculty groups on campus, suggesting these omissions were significant oversights.

Culpepper explained that, due to an agreement with Rankin Climate, only a limited set of variables could be selected for analysis, including gender, race, and one additional variable specific to undergraduates, graduates, faculty, and staff. Culpepper acknowledged that this restriction limited the depth of demographic analysis. However, Culpepper noted that the upcoming campus-level dashboard would enable further breakdown by disability and other demographics, with additional analysis anticipated soon.

Culpepper stated that differences among faculty from various appointment types were noted in the report. Additionally, the campus-level dashboard will allow for further analysis of professional track faculty, including intersections with other demographic variables such as race, gender, and disability.

Senator Simpkins, PTK, AGNR, inquired whether a similar survey would be conducted for individuals who have retired, transitioned to other positions, or left the institution in the past one to three years.

Culpepper responded that such a survey is not currently planned, but it will be considered for future campuswide surveys, which are anticipated to occur every four years.

Chair Sly thanked everyone and moved on to the next agenda item.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

---

Chair Sly opened the floor to new business.

Senator Hajiaghayi, TTK, CMNS, raised a concern regarding the use of campus sports facilities, particularly the pool, where both students and faculty face issues. Hajiaghayi noted that students are required to pay mandatory fees to access these facilities, but faculty receive limited discounts and still face challenges, such as overcrowding and inconvenient schedules. Hajiaghayi also mentioned that some lanes in the pool are often sold to other entities, limiting access for those who have already paid. Hajiaghayi proposed referring the issue to the facilities committee for further discussion and potential solutions.

Chair Sly responded that this issue does not fall under a policy matter, and there is no specific facilities group as described. However, if a motion is proposed, the University Senate Office can assist in developing it later.

Senator Lyons, Graduate, JOUR, introduced a Resolution in Support of Democratic Attempts to Obtain Graduate Worker Collective Bargaining Rights for consideration. This resolution is presented for discussion and consideration, noting that it is not a policy enactment but a statement of support.

Chair Sly noted that the meeting was ending and called for a motion to extend the meeting by ten minutes. Seconded. Chair Sly called for a vote on the motion to extend the meeting. The results were 56 in favor, 24 opposed, and 6 abstained. **The Senate votes in favor of extending the meeting by ten minutes.**

Chair Sly called for a discussion on the resolution.

Dean Roth, Graduate School, acknowledged the intent behind the resolution, and the advocacy of students working to improve graduate education is recognized. However, it is important to express opposition to the resolution for the following reasons:

1. Legal Limitations: Maryland state law does not permit Graduate Assistants (GAs) to form a union, and despite repeated requests, the state legislature has declined to approve such actions for several years.
2. Student Status: GAs are students first, receiving financial support to assist in their education, not employees. They are not hired under a typical employment process, and collective bargaining is not applicable to their role.
3. Current Support Structures: Graduate students are supported through both formal and informal channels, including high-ranking GA stipends compared to publicly funded peers, healthcare benefits, and improvements in graduate housing and policies. These efforts are informed by practices observed in unionized institutions across the country.
4. Impact on Faculty-Student Relationships: There are concerns that unionization will shift the focus of graduate education towards employment rather than mentorship, which could negatively affect the academic experience. Over 75% of graduate students reported satisfaction with their faculty advisor relationships in the recent belonging survey.

For these reasons, the recommendation is for senators to oppose the resolution.

Senator Lyons responded, noting a collaborative relationship with Dean Roth and emphasizing the unique responsibility of the Student Affairs Committee to represent the sentiments of the student body accurately. The remarks highlighted:

- Representation of Graduate Workers: The resolution does not challenge the classification of Graduate Assistants (GAs) as students first. However, it calls for the University Senate to recognize and support the democratic actions taken by graduate workers who have mobilized in pursuit of collective bargaining rights.
- University's Role in Legislative Advocacy: University of Maryland and University System of Maryland administrators have consistently advocated against legislative changes that would enable unionization for GAs. Lyons argued that the rationale often cited—that unionization disrupts mentorship—is unproven.

- Graduate Worker Concerns: Data from the recent belonging survey indicates concerns among graduate workers regarding compensation, housing affordability, and other quality-of-life issues. These concerns, while acknowledged as a collaborative priority, underscore ongoing areas for improvement in GA support.
- Democratic Process and Student Voice: Lyons emphasized the significance of democratic expression, noting that the Graduate Labor Union has garnered a supermajority in support of unionization. The resolution is presented not as a call for immediate union recognition but as a recognition of the importance of supporting democratic actions by students, especially those from minoritized groups, first-generation students, and those who experience financial hardship.

Lyons urged the Senate to approve the resolution as an affirmation of democratic principles and student advocacy.

Senator Wasdin, TTK, ARHU, expressed strong support for the resolution, noting appreciation for its introduction to the Senate. Speaking as a faculty member who works directly with graduate students, Wasdin asserted that enabling graduate students to form a collective bargaining unit would likely strengthen, rather than harm, faculty-student relationships. Observing the financial difficulties graduate students face in managing the high cost of living, Wasdin emphasized the potential for collective bargaining to help alleviate such struggles.

Additionally, Wasdin acknowledged Dean Roth's point regarding the legislature's current stance but argued that the Senate's endorsement would convey the body's support for graduate student collective bargaining to the Maryland legislature. Wasdin urged Senators to vote in favor of the resolution.

Senator Wohlfarth, TTK, BSOS, expressed that while the issue at hand is significant, the resolution is lengthy and requires further review. Wohlfarth suggested that Senators should have the opportunity to read it in detail before proceeding to a vote.

Chair Sly announced that, due to time constraints, the resolution would be included as a continuing business item for the December 4, 2024 meeting.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

---

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.



## Nominations Committee Slate 2024-2025

**PRESENTED BY** Sarah Dammeyer, Chair

**REVIEW DATES** SEC – November 13, 2024 | SENATE – December 4, 2024

**VOTING METHOD** In a single vote

**RELEVANT  
POLICY/DOCUMENT** N/A

**NECESSARY  
APPROVALS** Senate

### ISSUE

---

The University Senate Bylaws state, “By no later than the scheduled December meeting of the Senate, the Committee on Committees shall present to the Senate 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 not be accepted from the floor of the Senate. The Senate, as a body, shall approve the slate of nominees to serve on the Nominations Committee.”

### RECOMMENDATION(S)

---

The Committee on Committees recommends that the Senate approve the slate as presented.

### COMMITTEE WORK

---

The Committee on Committees Chair, Senate Chair-Elect Sarah Dammeyer, contacted all outgoing Senators through the Senate Office email on September 23, 2024 to invite them to volunteer to be considered for the Nominations Committee. The Senate Office sent follow-up emails and the volunteer opportunity was announced at the October 10, 2024 Senate meeting.

The Committee on Committees met on October 21, 2024 to discuss the nominees for the Senate Nominations Committee. The Committee on Committees discussed the volunteers at the meeting and voted on the final nomination slate. As required by the Bylaws, the committee assembled a total of eight nominees from among the Outgoing Senators to present to the Senate.

In addition to ensuring that all Senate constituencies were represented on the proposed Nominations Committee membership slate, the Committee on Committees endeavored to create a slate that represented a variety of Colleges/Schools, disciplines, positions, and backgrounds. The Committee on Committees voted to approve the slate on October 21, 2024.

### ALTERNATIVES

---

The Senate can decide not to approve the slate.

## **RISKS**

---

There are no risks to the University in approving the slate.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

---

There are no financial implications in approving the slate.

## 2024-2025 Senate Nominations Committee Slate

<u>Name / Constituency</u>	<u>Department/Unit</u>	<u>College</u>	<u>Term</u>
<b>Non-Voting Ex-Officio</b>			
Sarah Dammeyer	English	ARHU	2025
<b>Faculty</b>			
Karen Denny	Philip Merrill College of Journalism	JOUR	2025
Tamara Clegg	College of Information	INFO	2025
Kuishuang Feng	Geography	BSOS	2025
Alka Gandhi	Economics	BSOS	2025
<b>Exempt Staff</b>			
Gene Ferrick	College of Computer, Math and Natural Sciences	CMNS	2025
<b>Non-Exempt Staff</b>			
Antonietta Jennings	Inst for Governmental Service & Research	VPR	2025
<b>Undergraduate Seat</b>			
Zachary Braunstein	College of Arts and Humanities	ARHU	2025
<b>Graduate Seat</b>			
Diako Abbasi	A. James Clark School of Engineering	ENGR	2025



## UNIVERSITY SENATE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF DEMOCRATIC ATTEMPTS TO OBTAIN GRADUATE WORKER COLLECTIVE BARGAINING RIGHTS

**WHEREAS**, the faculty, staff, students, and administrators of the University of Maryland's College Park campus acknowledge ongoing collective bargaining efforts by employees of the University.

**WHEREAS**, the University Senate is the principal shared governance body of the University representing faculty, staff, students, and administrators, with the power to "develop and approve resolutions in order to take a public stance on" issues, stating values or concerns of the University community.

**WHEREAS**, in December of 2022, the 2022-2023 Graduate Student Government – an official representative body for graduate students at the University of Maryland, College Park "charged with securing and protecting the welfare, rights, and interests of all graduate students at this institution" – unanimously passed a legislative bill (1) supporting Collective Bargaining rights for graduate workers across the University System of Maryland.

**WHEREAS**, the Graduate Student Government deems Graduate Worker's access to Collective Bargaining "a democratic right" (2) Maryland State Law currently denies to student employees, including teaching assistants, research assistants, and other graduate employees within the University System of Maryland.

**WHEREAS**, University graduate workers formed a Graduate Labor Union (4) which achieved a supermajority on October 1, 2024, (5) and testified in favor of legislation allowing certain full-time and part-time faculty, postdoctoral associates, and graduate assistants collective bargaining rights (6).

**WHEREAS**, an unwillingness to voluntarily bargain with University of Maryland Graduate Labor Union presents serious challenges for graduate workers in minoritized populations (3) and the campus community, given significant reliance on this segment of the University workforce.

**WHEREAS**, despite requests signed by students, union members, and members of the University's Graduate Assistant Advisory Council (7), the University of Maryland, College Park, administration testified against Maryland state legislative action granting graduate workers collective bargaining rights.

**WHEREAS**, University administrators have openly stated: "At this point, the campus remains opposed to collective bargaining rights," for workers, claimed collective bargaining would limit the University's ability to work with graduate assistants directly, and asserted such work would limit student-mentor relationships with faculty (8).

**WHEREAS**, the right to collectively bargain with the University was enacted into law for certain state employees but not for graduate workers (9) following testimony by University administrators before the Maryland State House of Representatives and Senate.

**WHEREAS**, members of the Graduate Labor Union at the University of Maryland, College Park, have



requested voluntary recognition by the University and disavowed claims unionization would fray healthy mentorship and work relationships, outlining positive outcomes at institutions across the United States (10).

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the University Senate supports actions, including Collective Bargaining rights, which empower campus workers to negotiate conditions of employment with the University.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the body affirms and supports unanimous Graduate Student Government resolutions AND democratic campaigns providing workers collective bargain rights at the University of Maryland, College Park, through voluntary recognition or other means.

---

## References

1. [GSGA41-R09](#) – A Resolution to Support Collective Bargaining for Graduate Assistants and Employees in the University System of Maryland was unanimously passed by members of the University of Maryland’s Graduate Student Government in December of 2022.
2. [From GSG](#): “In December 2022, the 2022-2023 Graduate Student Government unanimously passed a legislative bill that advocates for allowance of graduate student workers across the University system of Maryland to access Collective Bargaining rights, which would allow for the ability to form a union and access a democratic right that has been a federal mandate since 1935.”
3. From [Commentary: Md. legislators don’t know it, but their next union vote will shape our future](#): “Better pay and working conditions for graduate workers will serve to make a graduate education more accessible to and obtainable for folks from diverse backgrounds and different walks of life. Unionizing graduate workers at UMD is an obvious and critical action to take,” doctoral research assistant Anthony Garove says. Without union voices, we could see fewer Maryland doctors and nurses of color, higher turnover among workers navigating student life and lackluster representation of those with disabilities in critical campus communities.
4. The [University of Maryland Graduate Labor Union](#) formed through the Fearless Student Employees group in fall of 2023. The union’s efforts have been bolstered through work with the United Auto Workers, which has represented some 100,000 higher education employees. This union is not formally recognized by the University of Maryland, College Park, nor is it recognized by UM System administrators for the purposes of negotiating outcomes on behalf of graduate employees.
5. During testimony before the Maryland House and Senate in Spring of 2024, Graduate Labor Union representatives presented physical cards that amounted to nearly 1 in 5 graduate students. As of October 1, 2024, members of the University of Maryland Graduate Labor Union card campaign report signed cards from 60% of graduate workers at the institution.
6. As reported by the Diamondback’s Sam Gauntt in [UMD graduate students, administrators testify on state collective bargaining bill](#) (February 16, 2024)
7. The [UMD Graduate Labor Union delivered a letter](#) to the Office of Provost Rice on February 12, 2024, “demanding neutrality from UMD admin” as legislation promoting collective bargaining rights entered the House and Senate. Members of the Graduate Assistant Advisory Council, among the signatories, highlighted the power of a stronger collective bargaining agreement while acknowledging the interim power that the current meet and confer process holds.
8. As reported by the Diamondback’s Sam Gauntt in [UMD graduate students, administrators testify on state collective bargaining bill](#) (February 16, 2024)
9. As reported by Maryland Matters reporter Elijah Pittman in [University System of Maryland,](#)

[AFSCME sign contract covering multiple campuses](#) (August 2, 2024)

10. From [Stop stifling UMD graduate workers' voices. Grant them collective bargaining rights:](#) Graduate workers at Michigan, Rutgers, Minnesota, NYU and more have unionized with great success. And graduate workers at all private universities already have collective bargaining rights, a fundamental step in forming a union. ... While the University of Maryland is not legally required to engage in collective bargaining with graduate workers, it can and should do so for the sake of all students and our shared learning conditions.

# The University of Maryland, College Park



## Graduate Assistant Support Fact Sheet

Contact: Dr. Jennifer King Rice, Senior Vice President and Provost, [provost@umd.edu](mailto:provost@umd.edu)

- UMD provides about 4300 graduate assistantships (GA), primarily to Ph.D. students. This allows UMD to recruit top students and GAs to pursue a degree without borrowing or outside employment. GAs receive a stipend and tuition benefits that exceed the cost of attendance, which is estimated according to Federal guidelines using surveys of actual student living expenses (see back of page).
- GAs assist faculty with teaching and/or research. GA duties are part of a student's education and count towards full-time status. The stipend is not considered salary or wages and is exempt from payroll taxes.
  - About 1600 GAs are research assistants that are supported by faculty research grants. Most do research that contributes directly to their dissertation and other degree requirements. For this reason, most institutions with collective bargaining exclude research assistants (see back of page).
- GAs duties are limited to 20 hours per week, averaged over the term of the appointment. The minimum stipends given below are equivalent to more than \$34 per hour.

Step level	9 months	9.5 months	12 months
Master's	\$25,538	\$26,958	\$34,052
Doctoral	\$26,038	\$27,486	\$34,718
Candidate	\$26,538	\$28,014	\$35,384

- Minimum stipends are 39% over Fall 2021 and by 67% over Fall 2017 levels. These substantial increases were achieved without collective bargaining. UMD minimum stipends are third among public Big Ten institutions, behind only Rutgers and Michigan (see back of page).
- Many departments set stipends above the minimum to compete with peer institutions in their field—up to \$43,400 (9/9.5 months) and \$44,200 (12 months). Average stipends are \$27,713 (9/9.5 months) and \$37,564 (12 months) based on 20 hours per week.
- The average GA stipend is equivalent to about \$74,244 per year on a full-time basis (40 hours per week, 12 months per year).
- Including summer employment and fellowships, 75% of GAs have full-year support from UMD. Most of the remainder have outside summer employment.
- GAs receive up to 10 credits of tuition each semester and 4 credits during winter term, with a value up to \$39,412 per year. GAs with 12-month appointments also receive 8 credits during summer term, for a total value up to \$46,036 per year in free tuition.
- GAs have access to the same health insurance plans on the same subsidized basis as faculty and staff. GA stipend and benefits are worth more than \$60,000 per year to the average student.
- A recent strike at the University of California lasted six weeks and resulted in canceled classes and final exams, closed labs, and delayed course grades. The union initially demanded a minimum stipend of \$54,000; they eventually agreed to \$34,000 (20 hr/wk, 9 months/yr). The increase in stipends totals more than \$200 million per year. This will be funded through some combination of increased state appropriations, increased tuition, and reduced numbers of graduate assistants and PhD students.

**Minimum Graduate Assistant Stipends and Collective Bargaining Status**  
Big Ten Public Universities, Fall 2023, 20 hour/week appointment

Institution	Minimum Stipend		Collective Bargaining?		
	Academic Year	Full Year	TA	AA	RA
Rutgers <sup>1</sup>	33,178	38,155	Y	Y	Y
Maryland <sup>2</sup>	27,486	34,718			
Michigan <sup>3</sup>		39,000	Y	Y	*
Penn State	22,005	29,340			
Indiana	22,000		Y	Y	Y
Ohio State	21,280	28,373			
Wisconsin	23,227	28,388			
Iowa	21,329	26,059	Y	Y	
Illinois	22,080	29,439	Y	Y	
Purdue	20,348	26,000			
Michigan St <sup>4</sup>	18,085	24,024	Y		
Minnesota	16,177	21,570	Y	Y	Y
Nebraska	14,00	17,865			

<sup>1</sup>Standard appointment is 15 hours per week.

<sup>2</sup>For doctoral students on 9.5 appointments, which comprise the majority of academic-year appointments; the minimum for master's students is \$26,958. All TAs and 70% of all academic-year GA appointments are 9.5-month appointments. The minimum stipend for 9-month appointments is \$25,538 for master's and \$26,038 for doctoral students.

<sup>3</sup>All GAs have moved to 12-month contracts in the last collective bargaining agreement in late 2023.

<sup>4</sup>For TAs. The minimum academic-year stipend for non-union AAs and RAs is \$15,561.

\*RAs are legally able to form a union as of Nov 2023; a vote by RAs is still pending.

**Average Cost of Attendance and Average Stipend, AY23-24 (9 months)**

Cost	Graduate Student	Graduate Assistant
Tuition (10 credits/semester)	\$36,100	—
Mandatory fees	\$1,283	\$1,283
Off-campus rent, utilities, food	\$15,902	\$15,902
Personal expenses	\$1,200	\$1,200
Books and supplies	\$1,000	\$1,000
Transportation	\$3,058	\$3,058
Health insurance	\$2,334	\$950
Income taxes	—	\$2,316*
Average cost of attendance	\$60,877	\$25,709
Average academic-year stipend	—	\$27,713

Tuition is at the non-resident rate. Health insurance is the employee portion of the lowest-cost State plan for GAs and the student health insurance plan for other students. Other costs are estimated by the Office of Student Financial Aid using federal guidelines; see <https://financialaid.umd.edu/resources-policies/cost-attendance>.

\*This is an estimate only and will vary widely depending on individual circumstances.