1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the September 8, 2020 Senate Minutes (Action)

3. Report of the Chair

4. Technical Revisions to the University of Maryland Non-Discrimination Policy and Procedures (Senate Document #20-21-04) (Information)

5. Review of the UMCP Policies and Procedures Concerning Telephone System Usage (Senate Document #19-20-51) (Action)

6. Revisions to the College of Information Studies (INFO) Plan of Organization (Senate Document #12-13-37) (Action)

7. Special Order
   Jack Blanchard
   Associate Provost for Enterprise Resource Planning
   *The Elevate Project: Next-Generation Administrative Computing at UMD*

8. Special Order
   Lisa Taneyhill
   Chair of the Research Council
   *Update on the Development of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes*

9. New Business

10. Adjournment
CALL TO ORDER

Senate Chair Laura Dugan called the meeting to order at 3:18 p.m.
Dugan welcomed Senators and provided brief instructions on how to use the TurningPoint platform for voting.

APPROVAL OF THE MAY 6, 2020 SENATE MINUTES

Chair Dugan asked if there were any revisions or corrections to the minutes.
Senator Sakurai raised a Point of Order that the minutes did not align with the provisions in the Senate Bylaws, which state, “The minutes shall include only actions and business transacted.”
Senate Director Montfort explained that providing additional context in the minutes is a long-standing practice that allows Senators who miss meetings to better understand the rationale behind the decisions made by the Senate.

Senator Sakurai made a motion to Commit the minutes to the Elections, Representation, and Governance (ERG) Committee with instructions to review and return the minutes in full compliance with the University’s governing documents, or to propose revisions to bring the Bylaws into alignment with long-standing practice. The motion was seconded.

Dugan opened the floor to discussion. Past Chair Pamela Lanford stated that her understanding of the criteria for the minutes was that it was a minimum, and that the added context fulfilled a need for Senators to understand what happened at the meeting so she was unclear about what the problem was. Lanford requested clarification of the issue. Senator Sakurai responded that the Bylaws reaffirm that minutes should only include the business transactions being made. Hearing no further discussion, Dugan called for a vote on the motion. The result was 48 in favor, 50 opposed, and 16 abstentions. **The motion to Commit the minutes to the ERG Committee failed.**

Dugan called for a vote to approve the minutes as distributed. The result was 102 in favor, 7 opposed, and 12 abstentions. **The minutes were approved as distributed.**

REPORT OF THE CHAIR

Chair Dugan acknowledged the passing of Dr. David Falk, Emeritus Professor of Physics and the first elected Chair of the Senate. She provided highlights of Dr. Falk’s extensive career of service to the University and noted that he had been honored by having the Senate Office Conference Room named after him as the Falk Room. She noted that Dr. Falk was one of the true legends of the Senate and the University, and that he will be sorely missed.

Dugan provided a detailed overview of the procedures and guidelines for the virtual meeting related to expectations, recording, muting, chat, participation, features, processes for introducing non-Senators, and voting processes.
Chair Dugan explained that the Legislation Log had been provided to the Senate as an information item to provide an overview of the work completed by the Senate last year as well as information on any items that carried over to this year. She noted that, despite the pandemic, Past Chair Lanford and the Senate were able to complete 45 Senate bills, and an additional three pieces of legislation were approved by the Senate and the President, pending higher-level approvals.

Chair Dugan presented the winners of the 2020 Council of University System Staff (CUSS) Elections: Elizabeth Hinson, Kalia Patricio, and Maureen Schrimpe were elected as the primary representatives and Meredith Carpenter, Dolores Jackson, and Jerry Lewis were elected as the alternate representatives.

Chair Dugan stated that this item is a technical amendment to the University’s Code of Student Conduct. She noted that the revisions to the Code update any references to the recently renamed interim University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on Sexual Harassment and Other Sexual Misconduct.

Dugan noted that the technical amendments had already been reviewed by the Senate leadership and approved by the President and do not require any further Senate action.

Chair Dugan explained that this item is a technical amendment to the University of Maryland Disability & Accessibility Policy and Procedures to update the name of the University’s Disability Support Services (DSS) to its new name, Accessibility and Disability Services (ADS).

Dugan noted that the technical amendments had already been reviewed by the Senate leadership and approved by the President and do not require any further Senate action.

Senator Sakurai raised a Point of Order regarding the order of agenda items and specifically inquired as to why the committee report was being presented before the special order item.

Dugan explained that the order of the agenda was developed to ensure that the action item could be completed without having to end discussion on the special order early in order to return to it.

Director Montfort clarified that the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) has the authority to set the Senate agenda.
Parliamentarian Henry stated that the Bylaws include a general rule regarding the order of business but ultimately the SEC sets the agenda and must distribute it ahead of time. He noted that the SEC is within its rights to change the order of the agenda.

Senator Sakurai moved that the Senate be asked to approve the order of the agenda by unanimous consent.

Dugan asked if there were any objections to approving the order of business on the agenda; hearing none, she moved to the next agenda item.

**APPROVAL OF THE 2020-2021 COMMITTEE & COUNCIL SLATES (SENATE DOCUMENT #20-21-02) (ACTION)**

Ellen Williams, Chair of the Committee on Committees, provided background on the slates. Williams made a motion to approve the standing committee and council slates as presented.

Chair Dugan asked whether there was discussion on the slates; seeing none, she called for a vote on the slates. The result was 125 in favor, 4 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the slates as presented was approved.**

**SPECIAL ORDER**

**Darryll J. Pines, President of the University of Maryland**

**2020 State of the Campus Address**

Chair Dugan introduced Darryll J. Pines, President of the University of Maryland, and invited him to give his *State of the Campus Address*. President Pines thanked the campus community for allowing him to be their President, and thanked Senators and the Senate Leadership for their service to the University in support of shared governance. He assured Senators that he would be in close contact with the Senate throughout his term as President.

President Pines summarized the University’s response to the coronavirus pandemic, shared enrollment numbers, updated his progress on his First Day Initiatives, emphasized his ongoing and unwavering commitment to anti-racism and social justice issues, and shared news regarding the University’s rankings and research enterprises. He also stated that excellence and partnerships are keys to transforming the University’s future.

**Campus Reopening & Safety Plans**

- Eight Return To Campus working groups developed the 4Maryland reopening plan.
- The current COVID-19 positivity rate is 1.21%. The University has the lowest rate of positive cases in the Big10 and among other large land-grant institutions.
- The University is planning to start in-person instruction on Monday, September 14, 2020.

**Enrollment Data**

- Fall enrollment numbers show:
  - An increase in enrollment of in-state students;
  - A significant increase in transfer enrollment of both in-state and out-of-state students; and
○ An overall net increase in freshmen and transfer enrollment of diverse populations including Asian, Black/African-American, International, Latinx, and those who are two or more ethnicities.

New Initiatives

- The President is waiting on a proposal from Vice President Perillo and Vice President Doge on an increase in staffing for mental health services.
- The University has finalized the hiring of a Coordinator for Immigrant and Undocumented Student Life, and the search for an ADA Coordinator will be launched shortly by the Office of Diversity & Inclusion.
- The University has increased philanthropic efforts and federal requests for funding to support students.
- The University has divested from the 1033 Program, and a task force on community policing has been charged to develop recommendations by December.
- The University is participating in efforts to increase voter registration, and the VoteTerp project was recently launched at the initiative of student athletes; through that project, the Xfinity Center will become a polling site for the upcoming general election.
- The University recently joined the Common App and will no longer require SAT and ACT tests for undergraduate admissions, in order to increase accessibility and target a broader population of students who were not previously applying, which likely included more diverse candidates as well.
- The TerrapinSTRONG onboarding program for everyone is being developed and is underway within some units on campus.
- The Office of Diversity and Inclusion has created an anti-racism toolkit for faculty, staff, and students.
- The President will soon be reviewing recommendations to update curricula to enhance diversity, equity, and inclusion education.
- The President will be hosting the Voices of Maryland Listening Sessions to hear from the campus community on an ongoing basis.
- The University System of Maryland has approved the honorific renaming of the Women’s Studies Department to the Harriet Tubman Department of Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies.
- The Office of Diversity & Inclusion has partnered with the University of Virginia to study slavery and higher education; UMD has created the 1856 Project to study the University of Maryland’s past to move forward for its future.

Rankings & Research News

- The University’s ranking in the U.S. News and World Report Undergraduate Rankings will be announced next week. Other rankings show progress in key areas:
  ○ The Computer Science department was ranked ninth by CEO World.
- The University’s research enterprise is growing.
  ○ The University is on a trajectory to get over $600M in research funding.
○ The College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, the A. James Clark School of Engineering, and the College of Education each had a record year in research funding.
○ The University has created multiple new agreements and has announced major new collaborations with the intelligence community.
○ The University had a top 100 finish for the MacArthur $100 Million Program.

Dugan thanked President Pines for his presentation. Prior to opening the floor to discussion, she recognized the Chair-Elect, Ellen Williams.

Chair-Elect Williams made a procedure motion to limit all speakers to two minutes each during the Q&A, and to limit Senators from speaking again until all others who wished to do so had the opportunity. The motion was seconded.

Chair Dugan called for a vote on the motion. The result was 128 in favor, and 4 opposed. The procedure motion passed.

Chair Dugan noted that a timer would be displayed on the screen to help speakers keep track of their time.

Q & A
Senators asked President Pines questions about the emphasis placed on GPA in admissions given the decision to remove the SAT/ACT requirement, union involvement in decisions related to telework and employee safety, and the University’s fiscal standing.

President Pines emphasized the holistic nature of the admissions process, the importance of giving supervisors the flexibility to make telework decisions at the unit level, and noted that there would be an upcoming Budget Town Hall that will address any questions or concerns related to the budget. Senators shared concerns about staff members who suffer from chronic conditions, questioned what options are available to faculty and staff if someone is not in compliance with safety rules, expressed concerns regarding freedom of speech, and questioned the safety of unlocked campus buildings.

President Pines acknowledged that telework is the safest option for those at high risk, discussed the campus’s de-densification, shared that student health ambassadors had been hired to encourage safety compliance, stated his support for free speech, and noted that he will look into issues related to building safety.

Senators expressed appreciation for the campus commitment to racial justice and for the University’s commitment to protecting the more vulnerable populations during the budget cutbacks.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.
Technical Revisions to the University of Maryland Non-Discrimination Policy and Procedures

PRESENTED BY
Reka S. Montfort, Executive Secretary & Director

REVIEW DATES
SEC – September 25, 2020 | SENATE – October 7, 2020

VOTING METHOD
In a single vote

RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT
VI-1.00(B) – University of Maryland Non-Discrimination Policy & Procedures

NECESSARY APPROVALS
N/A

ISSUE
On August 14, 2020, the President approved an interim University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on Sexual Harassment and Other Sexual Misconduct (VI-1.60[A]) to comply with the Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights’ new Title IX regulations that require all higher education institutions to be in compliance by August 14, 2020. The University System of Maryland (USM) revised its the University System of Maryland Policy on Sexual Harassment (VI-1.60) in July 2020. All system institutions were tasked with revising their policies to align with the USM policy and the new Title IX regulations by August 14, 2020. The interim policy and procedures was approved by President Pines pending Senate review (Senate Document #20-21-03) and (Senate Document #20-21-08).

As a result of the revisions, the name of the Sexual Misconduct Policy was changed so all references to the previous name in other University policies must be updated. The proposed technical amendments to the University of Maryland Non-Discrimination Policy & Procedures (VI-1.00[B]) reflect the updates to the name of the Sexual Misconduct Policy and updates to a few additional references of University policies and policy links for consistency.

RECOMMENDATION(S)
The technical revisions are provided for informational purposes.

COMMITTEE WORK
N/A

ALTERNATIVES
N/A

RISKS
N/A

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
N/A
I. POLICY STATEMENT

The University of Maryland is committed to creating and maintaining an educational, working, and living environment that is free from discrimination and harassment. This Policy prohibits discrimination on grounds protected under Federal and Maryland law and Board of Regents policies. University programs, activities, and facilities are available to all without regard to race, color, sex\(^1\), gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, marital status, age, national origin, political affiliation, physical or mental disability\(^2\), religion, protected veteran status, genetic information, personal appearance, or any other legally protected class. Retaliation against any individual who files a complaint or participates in an investigation under this Policy is strictly prohibited. In furtherance of the University’s commitment to equal opportunity, this Policy and associated procedures are established to address and remedy complaints of discrimination, harassment, and retaliation based on a protected class.

The Office of Civil Rights & Sexual Misconduct (OCRSM) shall receive all complaints of discrimination and harassment made pursuant to this Policy. Complaints may also be filed online using the Discrimination Complaint Form at https://www.ocrsm.umd.edu/discrimination/index.html.

Office of Civil Rights & Sexual Misconduct (OCRSM)
University of Maryland
4113 Susquehanna Hall
4200 Lehigh Road
College Park, MD 20742-5031
E-mail: civilrights@umd.edu

---

1 Complaints based on sexual misconduct will be addressed under the University’s Sexual Misconduct Policy & Procedures VI-1.60(A) as appropriate. Complaints of discrimination based on sex, gender identity or gender expression, and sexual orientation that do not involve misconduct of a sexual nature will be addressed under this Non-Discrimination Policy and Procedures (Non-Discrimination Policy). Complaints based on sexual misconduct will be addressed under the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on Sexual Harassment and Other Sexual Misconduct (VI-1.60[A]) (Sexual Misconduct Policy), as appropriate. When the Title IX Officer determines based on its initial assessment, or following a mandatory or permissive dismissal, that the alleged sexual misconduct would not constitute a potential violation under the Sexual Misconduct Policy if substantiated, the Title IX Officer may refer the report to this Non-Discrimination Policy, as appropriate.

2 The University’s policy and procedures for requesting disability accommodations may be found in the VI-1.00(D) University of Maryland Disability & Accessibility Policy and Procedures (VI-1.00[D]). Complaints of discrimination on the basis of disability may be made under this Non-Discrimination Policy.
II. APPLICABILITY

This Policy applies to members of the University community, including students, trainees, faculty, staff, and certain third parties (e.g., visitors, volunteers, applicants for admission or employment, vendors, and contractors) while on University property or while participating in University sponsored activities who either carry out discrimination or are subject to it.

This Policy applies to discrimination, harassment, or retaliation:

- on University premises, in any University facility, or on University property; and/or
- at any University sponsored, recognized, or approved program, visit, or activity, regardless of location; and
- that impedes equal access to any University education program or activity or that adversely impacts the education or employment of a member of the University community regardless of where the conduct occurred.

III. DEFINITIONS

“Discrimination” is unequal treatment based on a legally protected status that is sufficiently serious to unreasonably interfere with or limit an individual’s opportunity to participate in or benefit from a University program or activity, or that otherwise adversely affects a term or condition of the individual’s employment or education.

“Harassment” is a form of discrimination (as defined above) that encompasses unwelcome conduct based on a person’s protected status. Harassment is severe or pervasive conduct that negatively affects the particular individual and also would negatively affect a reasonable person under the same circumstances. Harassment in violation of this Policy depends on the totality of the circumstances, including the nature, frequency, and duration of the conduct in question, the location and context in which it occurs, and the status of the individuals involved. Harassing behaviors may include, but are not limited to, the following, when based on a person’s protected status:

- conduct, whether verbal, physical, written, graphic, or electronic that threatens, intimidates, offends, belittles, denigrates, or shows an aversion toward an individual or group;
- epithets, slurs, or negative stereotyping, jokes, or nicknames;
- written, printed, or graphic material that contains offensive, denigrating, or demeaning comments, or pictures; and
- the display of offensive, denigrating, or demeaning objects, e-mails, text messages, or cell phone pictures.

“Personal appearance” means the outward appearance of any person irrespective of sex with regard to hairstyle, beards, or manner of dress. It shall not relate, however, to the requirement of
cleanliness, uniforms, or prescribed attire when uniformly applied for admittance to a public accommodation or a class of employees for a customary or reasonable business-related purpose.

“Retaliation” refers to action that is taken against an individual because they reported discrimination, filed a complaint of discrimination, or participated in an investigation or proceeding concerning a discrimination complaint.

IV. COMPLAINT PROCEDURES

Generally, a complaint filed under another University policy or Maryland statute cannot also be addressed under this Policy. Students, staff, and faculty must choose between the different complaint processes available to them.

A. Reporting

Individuals who experience violations of this Policy are encouraged to promptly file a complaint with the OCRSM or bring it directly to the attention of their supervisor.

Supervisors, faculty, and University administrators who receive or become aware of a complaint of conduct in violation of this Policy are encouraged to report it to the OCRSM. This does not apply to confidential resources on campus, such as the University Counseling Center, Health Center, Mental Health Services, and University Chaplains.

B. Timeliness

Complaints must be made within ninety (90) business days of the incident(s). The OCRSM may waive the time limit upon a showing of good cause.

C. Initial Assessment

Written complaints are encouraged, but not required. If a verbal complaint is made, the OCRSM will prepare a written statement of the allegations and the Complainant will be required to acknowledge its accuracy in writing. The OCRSM will acknowledge receipt of the complaint by sending a notification letter or contacting the Complainant directly within five (5) business days of receipt. The OCRSM will then conduct an initial assessment of the complaint to determine whether the complaint should be investigated, and will consider the Complainant’s request that the complaint be investigated or not investigated. The OCRSM will then notify the complainant whether:

- the complaint is appropriately filed with the OCRSM and the OCRSM has jurisdiction over the alleged conduct and the Respondent;
- the complaint has previously been filed under another University policy or Maryland statute;
- the complaint is suitable for alternative resolution; and
- the allegations, if true, would constitute a Policy violation.
If it is determined that the complaint is not appropriately filed with the OCRSM, the Complainant will be informed of the reason.

D. Alternative Resolution Process

When determined appropriate by the OCRSM, the Complainant may elect to resolve a complaint through Alternative Resolution. The purpose of Alternative Resolution is to resolve the complaint by conference and conciliation. The OCRSM will notify and advise supervisors and other administrators, as appropriate, of the complaint and efforts by the parties to proceed with Alternative Resolution. The OCRSM shall document efforts to resolve the complaint and whether or not those efforts were successful. When Alternative Resolution is successful, the OCRSM shall summarize the resolution in writing, have it signed by the parties, and provide signed copies to the respective parties and supervisors and administrators, as appropriate. The OCRSM will also monitor implementation of the resolution agreement and/or close the case. When Alternative Resolution does not succeed within forty-five (45) business days of the date the complaint is filed, the OCRSM will cease that process and begin the investigation process.

E. Investigation

When the Initial Assessment or a failure of the Alternative Resolution process results in a determination that the OCRSM will investigate the complaint, the OCRSM shall advise the Complainant and Respondent of their rights under this Policy, including the following:

- both parties have a right to an impartial investigation;
- both parties have a right to produce relevant documents, witnesses, and other material they would like the investigation to include; and
- both parties may have an advisor of their choice present to provide advice during the investigative interview; however, the advisor may not speak or act on behalf of the party.

The OCRSM will assign an investigator\(^3\) who will conduct an adequate, reliable, and impartial investigation of the complaint. The investigator will interview the Complainant and the Respondent and any other available relevant witnesses, and review available relevant documents.

1. Standard of Review

In making the determination of whether a Policy violation has occurred, the standard of review is “preponderance of the evidence,” which means it is more likely than not that a Policy violation occurred.

---

\(^3\) An investigator in the OCRSM, for purposes of state employment regulations, is also considered to be the Fair Practices Officer.
2. **Expectation of Cooperation**  
Absent good cause, all parties and identified witnesses shall cooperate during the investigation by being available during reasonable business hours to discuss the complaint and by making available any relevant information requested by the investigator.

3. **Investigation Timeline**  
The OCRSM seeks to complete an investigation within sixty (60) business days and may extend the time frames set forth in this Policy for good cause. Exceptions to this timeframe may vary depending on the complexity of the investigation, access to relevant parties, and the severity and extent of the alleged discrimination.

4. **False Information**  
Anyone who knowingly files a false complaint under this Policy or who knowingly provides false information to the OCRSM during an investigation will be subject to appropriate disciplinary action.

5. **Written Investigation Report and Findings**  
The OCRSM shall complete a written report of its investigation, including a summary of the allegations, evidence reviewed and witness statements, findings of material fact and an analysis of those facts, and a conclusion stating whether the Policy was violated, based on the preponderance of evidence standard. The OCRSM then will issue a *Notice of Findings* and/or provide a copy of the investigation report to the parties and to the appropriate supervisors or department/unit heads, or the Office of Student Conduct, depending on the status of the parties. Copies of the investigation report may be redacted to comply with applicable law.

V. **APPEAL**

The Complainant and/or Respondent may appeal the investigation finding within five (5) business days of the date of receipt of the *Notice of Findings* by submitting to the OCRSM at civilrights@umd.edu a written statement of their intent to appeal and the stated grounds. The scope of the appeal is limited to the grounds set forth below. Mere dissatisfaction with the finding is not a valid basis for appeal. If an appeal is received by the OCRSM, the other party will be notified and given five (5) business days from the date of receipt of that notice to respond by submitting a written statement to the OCRSM at civilrights@umd.edu. All appeals and responses shall include the case name, number, and the party’s name and contact information. Appeals filed by more than one party will be considered together in one appeal review process. All appeal documents submitted by a party will be shared with the other party.

If neither party submits an appeal, the decision will be considered final five (5) business days after the last date either party received the *Notice of Findings*. Appeals submitted after five (5) business days shall be denied, except upon a showing of good cause.
A. Grounds for Appeal

Either party may appeal the Finding only on the following grounds:

1. **Substantial Procedural Error**
   Procedural errors or errors in interpretation of University policy were so substantial as to effectively deny a Complainant or Respondent notice or a fair opportunity to be heard.

2. **New Evidence**
   New relevant, material evidence that a reasonably diligent person could not have discovered prior to the issuance of the *Notice of Findings* has become available.

B. Review

The appealing party has the burden of proof, and the standard of proof is preponderance of the evidence. Appeals are not intended to allow for a review of the entire investigation, with the exception of new evidence, as referenced above. The appellate review will be based on the written record; parties are not entitled to a hearing or meeting with the reviewing administrator or designee.

Appeals will be reviewed in accordance with the Respondent’s status as listed below:

- appeals involving a Staff Respondent shall be reviewed by the Vice President for Administration & Finance or designee;
- appeals involving a Faculty Respondent shall be reviewed by the Senior Vice President and Provost or designee;
- appeals involving a Student Respondent shall be reviewed by the Vice President for Student Affairs or designee;
- appeals that do not directly involve a faculty, staff, or student Respondent shall be reviewed by the Vice President for Administration & Finance or designee.

C. Outcome

Upon receipt of the appeal and response, the OCRSM will forward them to the respective Vice President’s Office. Within five (5) business days, the Vice President will issue a written determination stating whether the Appeal was granted or denied, including a summary of its rationale (the “Appeal Outcome”). The Appeal Outcome shall either:

- affirm the Finding,
- overturn and Reverse Finding, or
- send the Case Back to the Special Investigator with specific directions to reconsider the Finding.

The decision of the Vice President or designee as set forth in the Appeal Outcome shall be final. The Vice President shall forward a copy of the Appeal Outcome to the OCRSM.
The OCRSM will forward a copy of the Appeal Outcome to the parties and respective supervisor/unit head/department chair or dean/Director of Student Conduct as soon as possible.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION

The OCRSM may provide the appropriate Vice President, supervisor, and department chair dean with a Recommendation for Corrective Action. The final decision for determining and implementing any necessary corrective action shall remain the responsibility of the appropriate Vice President or designee. The Vice President or designee will notify the OCRSM within ten (10) business days of any corrective action that has been implemented.

The OCRSM is responsible for monitoring efforts to ensure that any ongoing violations of the Policy cease. In the event corrective action requires specific anti-discrimination training not readily available to the parties, the OCRSM will work with the supervisor and/or department/unit head to ensure training occurs as soon as feasible.

VII. DISCIPLINARY ACTION

A. Students

With respect to Student Respondents, the Director of the Office of Student Conduct (OSC) in accordance with the provisions of the Code of Student Conduct is responsible for imposing disciplinary action.

1. Discipline that impacts a student’s status with the University includes: expulsion, suspension for a definite or indefinite period, and disciplinary probation for a definite or indefinite period. Expulsion, suspension, and disciplinary probation will be noted on a student’s transcript. Disciplinary suspensions and expulsions are subject to the approval of the Vice President for Student Affairs.

2. Discipline that does not impact a student’s status with the University includes but is not limited to: educational requirements, “no contact” orders, housing restrictions, community service, and disciplinary reprimand. Failure to comply with any of the sanctions listed above may result in further disciplinary action that could impact a student’s disciplinary status with the University.

The OCRSM may provide other remedies, in consultation with the OSC, as appropriate. These remedies will identify reasonable long-term or permanent remedies to address the effects of the conduct on the Complainant, restore the Complainant’s safety and well-being and maximize the Complainant’s educational and employment opportunities. Remedies may also be identified to address the effects of the conduct on the University community.

Students may appeal discipline imposed as a result of a violation of this Policy in accordance with the Code of Student Conduct.
B. Staff

With respect to Staff Respondents, any disciplinary action or corrective measures will be imposed by the appropriate supervisor and unit head, in consultation with the Assistant Vice President for Human Resources, the Director of the OCRSM, and other relevant administrators, as needed. This may include the following:

- unit transfers;
- reassignment of duties;
- mandatory training;
- verbal reminders;
- written reminders/letters of reprimand;
- suspension without Pay;
- suspension pending charges of removal; and
- termination.

Staff may grieve discipline imposed as a result of a violation of this Policy in accordance with their respective grievance rights.

C. Faculty

With respect to Faculty Respondents, disciplinary action or corrective measures will be imposed by the appropriate supervisor and unit head, in consultation with the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Director of the OCRSM, and other relevant administrators, as needed. This may include the following:

- reassignment of duties;
- mandatory training;
- verbal reminders;
- written reminders/letters of reprimand;
- suspension with or without pay; and
- termination.

Faculty may grieve discipline imposed as a result of a violation of this Policy in accordance with their respective grievance rights.

D. Records Retention

The OCRSM will maintain the records relating to the investigation. The respective unit responsible for issuing any discipline will maintain any disciplinary records in accordance with the University’s records retention schedule. The respective unit shall also provide a copy of the disciplinary records to the OCRSM.
VIII. EXTERNAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES THAT ADDRESS DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINTS

Filing an employment discrimination complaint under this Policy or an alternative campus procedure does not preclude an employee from filing a complaint with the Maryland Commission on Civil Rights, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, or the Office for Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Education.

Complainants who wish to file discrimination complaints that are not connected with the official functions of the University or not falling within the scope of this Policy, will be referred to appropriate University, County, State, or Federal agencies by the OCRSM.

**Office for Civil Rights U.S. Department of Education**
Philadelphia Office (Regional Office for Maryland)
The Wanamaker Building
100 Penn Square East, Suite 515
Philadelphia, PA 19107-3323
Phone: 215-656-8541
FAX: 215-656-8605
TDD: 800-877-8339
Email: OCR.Philadelphia@ed.gov
Website: [http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/index.html](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/index.html)

**Maryland Commission on Civil Rights**
Phone: 410-767-8600
Website: [http://mccr.maryland.gov/](http://mccr.maryland.gov/)

**Equal Employment Opportunity Commission**
Phone: 800-669-4000
TTY: 800-669-6820
Website: [https://egov.eeoc.gov/eas/](https://egov.eeoc.gov/eas/)

It is important to note that in order to protect certain legal rights and remedies, Complainants must comply with certain time limits and deadlines. Affected persons should contact the relevant agencies listed above to verify time limits for filing. Failure to meet required deadlines may result in a loss of rights to seek a legal remedy.

Replacement for:
*Policy VI-1.00(B) University of Maryland Code on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion*
Review of the UMCP Policies and Procedures Concerning Telephone System Usage

PRESENTED BY Derek Richardson, Chair

REVIEW DATES SEC – September 25, 2020 | SENATE – October 7, 2020

VOTING METHOD In a single vote

RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT X-3.00(A) – University of Maryland, College Park Policies and Procedures Concerning Telephone System Usage

NECESSARY APPROVALS Senate, President

ISSUE

The University of Maryland, College Park Policies and Procedures Concerning Telephone System Usage (X-3.00[A]), approved August 1, 1991 contains outdated language and references to services that no longer exist or that have changed significantly. Examples include mention of campus public telephones and 1-900 numbers, which no longer exist, and operator-assisted conference calls, which are obsolete. In addition, the Department of Communication Services referenced in the document has been subsumed by the Division of Information Technology (IT).

RECOMMENDATION(S)

The IT Council recommends that the revised University of Maryland Policy on Telephone System Usage (X-3.00[A]) immediately following the report be approved.

COUNCIL WORK

The IT Council formed a task force to examine the policy and make recommendations to bring the document up to date with modern practice. The task force met in person on February 6, 2020 and completed its work remotely over the following several months. The task force found multiple instances in the existing policy where changes are recommended. Also, task force members were assigned to review similar policies and procedures at Big 10 and other peer institutions. Following consultation with representatives of the Division of IT, the policy was revised to add a new section about 911 services. The Office of Legal Counsel approved the proposed revised policy on August 4, 2020. The IT Council unanimously approved the proposed revised policy on August 17, 2020.

ALTERNATIVES

The Senate could decline to approve the revised policy. The current policy would remain in effect and would remain inconsistent with current practice and best practice regarding 911 emergency services.
RISKS

There are no risks to the University in adopting these recommendations.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no known financial implications to the University in adopting these recommendations.
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BACKGROUND

The University of Maryland, College Park Policies and Procedures Concerning Telephone System Usage (X-3.00[A]), approved August 1, 1991 (Appendix 1), contains outdated language and references to services that no longer exist or that have changed significantly. Examples include mention of campus public telephones and 1-900 numbers, which no longer exist, and operator-assisted conference calls, which are obsolete. In addition, the Department of Communication Services referenced in the document has been subsumed by the Division of Information Technology (IT). On December 18, 2019, the Vice President for Information Technology & Chief Information Officer (VP and CIO) requested that the Information Technology (IT) Council form a task force to examine Policy X-3.00(A) and make recommendations to bring the document up to date with current practice and best practices. The IT Council agreed and made a request to the University Senate for a formal Charge (Appendix 2).

COUNCIL WORK

The task force that convened to consider revisions to Policy X-3.00(A) consisted of the IT Council Chair, three other members of the IT Council, and a technical representative from Division of IT. The task force met in person on February 6, 2020 and completed its work remotely over the following several months. The task force found multiple instances in the existing policy where changes are recommended, including those noted previously and various details regarding how records are kept. Also, per the charge from the Senate, task force members were assigned to review similar policies and procedures at Big 10 and other peer institutions. Specifically, the task force examined materials found online at the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, the Ohio State University, Rutgers State University, University of Iowa, University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, Purdue University, and University of Wisconsin, along with University of Chicago, and Tennessee Tech University. In all cases, peer policies, where available, were in line with the revised proposed policy, except several included language regarding 911 emergency services that the existing Maryland policy lacks. Following consultation with representatives of the
Division of IT, the policy was revised to add a new section about such services. This brings the policy in line with the recent Kari’s Law and Ray Baum’s Act. The Office of General Counsel approved the proposed revised policy on August 4, 2020. The IT Council unanimously approved the proposed revised policy on August 17, 2020.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The IT Council recommends that the revised University of Maryland Policy on Telephone System Usage (X-3.00[A]) immediately following this report be approved.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 — Current Policy (X-3.00[A])
Appendix 2 — Charge from the Senate Executive Committee
I. Policy

A. The University of Maryland, College Park (hereafter “University”) Campus telephone system provides service for conducting University of Maryland at College Park hereinafter "University" business. Use of the telephone system is subject to University network policies along with this policy.

B. The Division of Information Technology (DIT) is responsible for and operates the University’s telephone system.

C. Personal calls of a non-emergency nature should be charged to home telephones or made using a personal device, whenever possible from public telephones located on Campus.

D. Third-party calls may not be charged to a University telephone number and nor collect calls will collect calls not be accepted by the University. Calls to 900, 976 or any other "pay" numbers are prohibited and the caller shall be subject to disciplinary action. Abusive or inappropriate use of the telephone system shall result in disciplinary action. Individual users are responsible for any damage to the telephone system or equipment caused as a result of inappropriate use.

E. The University is charged will apply for each international calls and some local long-distance and directory-assisted assistance calls dialed, so therefore, discretion is encouraged when using telephone services.

F. Abusive or inappropriate use of the telephone system shall result in disciplinary action. Individual users are responsible for any damage to the telephone system or equipment caused as a result of inappropriate use.

II. General Operation of the Telephone System

The Department of Communication Services is responsible for the telephone system, and is available to answer any questions and offer instruction concerning the use of the telephone system and equipment.
II. III. Telephone System Records

A. A record is kept by DIT that includes the number called as well as the campus location and extension of the phone used to make the call of all calls made from on-campus telephones at UMCP indicating the number called and the number and location of origin is kept by Telecommunication Services. Summaries of the record of local calls and call details are available of long distance calls is sent to each department business managers for review and verification each month.

B. All records of telephone system usage, are the property of the University of Maryland at College Park. Such records shall be provided to the appropriate authorities, including the police, when there is suspicion of wrong doing. Records shall also be provided upon request in personnel actions to appropriate University officials. Campus telephone operators and Communication Services employees have the authority, when directed to do so by the Director of Communications Services, to work with the police in obtaining information concerning malicious or threatening calls. The on-campus location of the and phone and incoming and outgoing phone numbers, are the property of the University number of calls placed may be provided as part of such an investigation.

IV. Emergency "Barge In"
Campus telephone operators have the authority to barge into a telephone line in cases where a caller reports an emergency to determine whether the line is in operation. The decision to do so is within the discretion of the operator.

III. V. Telephone Number Information Services

A. Campus telephone numbers may be obtained in the University’s Faculty/Staff Telephone Directory. For additional information, the Campus Telephone Operator may be consulted by dialing “0” from any campus phone.

B. The Campus Operator will not provide home telephone numbers and message services shall not be provided by the Telephone Operator, nor shall operators place off-campus calls for campus callers.

VI. Conference Calls
Conference calls with more than three people located off-campus need operator assistance. This service may be provided by campus operators or through the telephone company operator. There is a charge for this service. When the service is provided by telephone company operators it must be billed to a telephone credit card. University telephone credit cards are available upon request from the Department of Communication Services. Conference calls for official University business may be reimbursed by the department.

IV. VII. Voicemail Voice-Mail

A. The voicemail voice-mail system should is to be used for legitimate purposes only.
B. University employees should use the **system service** for official University business.

C. Resident students may use the **voicemail system in their residence** for personal messages, but there should be no abusive messages, and no use that which would damage or hinder the functioning of the system are **prohibited**.

D. Any abuse of the **voicemail Voice Mail System** shall result in disciplinary action and reimbursement to the University for any damage caused to the system.

E. Voicemails that are forwarded to or accessed through email are subject to the **IT Standard: Institutional Email (IT-14)** and may be considered “records” covered by the Maryland Public Information Act.

V. Emergency Calls

A. Emergency calls from the University can be placed with or without the external prefix (i.e., 9-911 or 911). This applies to both on-campus devices, which route to UMPD/Public Safety, as well as devices at remote sites, which route to a local Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP).

B. Location information sent to the respective PSAP includes the caller’s street address, floor level, room, and/or suite information, as provided through an integration with the E911 location service.
SECTION X: MISCELLANEOUS POLICIES

Policy Number: X-3.00(A)

University of Maryland, College Park Policies and Procedures Concerning Telephone System Usage

Consolidated USM and UMD Policies and Procedures

APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT 1 AUGUST 1991

I. Policy
The Campus telephone system provides service for conducting University of Maryland at College Park hereinafter “University” business. Personal calls of a non-emergency nature should be charged to home telephones or made from public telephones located on Campus. No third party calls may be charged to a University telephone number nor will collect calls be accepted by the University. Calls to 900, 976 or any other "pay" numbers are prohibited and the caller shall be subject to disciplinary action. Abusive or inappropriate use of the telephone system shall result in disciplinary action. Individual users are responsible for any damage to the telephone system or equipment caused as a result of inappropriate use. The University is charged for each local, long distance and directory assistance call dialed, therefore, discretion is encouraged when using telephone services.

II. General Operation of the Telephone System
The Department of Communication Services is responsible for the telephone system, and is available to answer any questions and offer instruction concerning the use of the telephone system and equipment.

III. Telephone System Records
A record of all calls made from on-campus telephones at UMCP indicating the number called and the number and location of origin is kept by Telecommunication Services. A summary of the record of local calls and details of long distance calls is sent to each department for review and verification each month. All records of telephone system usage are the property of the University of Maryland at College Park. Such records shall be provided to the appropriate authorities, including the police, when there is suspicion of wrong doing. Records shall also be provided upon request in personnel actions to appropriate University officials. Campus telephone operators and Communication Services employees have the authority, when directed to do so by the Director of Communications Services, to work with the police in obtaining information concerning malicious or threatening calls. The on-campus location and phone number of calls placed may be provided as part of such an investigation.

IV. Emergency "Barge In"
Campus telephone operators have the authority to barge into a telephone line in cases where a caller reports an emergency to determine whether the line is in operation. The decision to do so is within the discretion of the operator.

V. Telephone Number Information Services
Campus telephone numbers may be obtained in the Faculty/Staff Telephone Directory. For additional information, the Campus Telephone Operator may be consulted. Home telephone numbers and message services shall not be provided by the Telephone Operator, nor shall operators place off-campus calls for campus callers.

VI. Conference Calls
Conference calls with more than three people located off-campus need operator assistance. This service may be provided by campus operators or through the telephone company operator. There is a charge for this service. When the service is provided by telephone company operators it must be billed to a telephone credit card. University telephone credit cards are available upon request from the Department of Communication Services. Conference calls for official University business may be reimbursed by the department.
The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and Senate Chair Lanford request that the Information Technology (IT) Council review the University of Maryland, College Park Policies and Procedures Concerning Telephone System Usage.

Specifically, the IT Council should:

1. Review the University of Maryland, College Park Policies and Procedures Concerning Telephone System Usage (X-3.00[A]).

2. Review similar policies or procedures on telephone system usage at Big 10 and other peer institutions.

3. Consult with a representative of Division of Information Technology.

4. Consider whether the policy aligns with current practices related to telephone system usage at the University.

5. Consider whether there are outdated elements of the policy that should be removed.

6. Consider whether the language in the policy should be broadened to accommodate any future changes in technology.

7. Consult with a representative of the Office of General Counsel on any proposed changes to the University’s policy.

8. If appropriate based on the council’s consideration of the above items, recommend whether the policy should be revised and if so, provide suggested revisions.

We ask that you submit a report to the Senate Office no later than October 1, 2020. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.
Revisions to the College of Information Studies Plan of Organization

| PRESENTED BY | Marcia Shofner, Chair |
| REVIEW DATES | SEC – September 25, 2020 | SENATE – October 7, 2020 |
| VOTING METHOD | In a single vote |
| RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT | UMD Plan of Organization for Shared Governance, University Senate Bylaws |
| NECESSARY APPROVALS | Senate, President |

ISSUE

The University of Maryland Plan of Organization for Shared Governance mandates that all Colleges, Schools, and the Libraries be governed by a Plan of Organization. These Plans must conform to provisions and principles set forth in the University’s Plan, the Bylaws of the University Senate, and the Policy on Shared Governance in the University System of Maryland, as well as with best practices in shared governance. Revisions to the Plan of Organization of each College, School, and the Libraries must be reviewed and approved by the University Senate. The Senate Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee is the standing committee responsible for conducting these reviews. The College of Information Studies (INFO) submitted a revised Plan of Organization in December 2012.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

The ERG Committee recommends that the Senate approve the revised University of Maryland College of Information Studies Plan of Organization.

COMMITTEE WORK

In Spring 2013, the ERG Committee conducted an in-depth assessment of the revised Plan. In May 2013, ERG provided feedback, and INFO returned a revised Plan in December 2014. The committee met with representatives of INFO in April 2015 to discuss the revised Plan. In September 2017, the Chair and Coordinator met with the Dean and the Senior Associate Dean of INFO to align expectations and establish a timeline for revisions.

In March 2018, ERG received a new draft Plan. The committee developed feedback related to the INFO College Assembly and various committees; meaningful participation; and representation for constituency groups. ERG provided this feedback in May 2018, and INFO returned a new draft in October 2018 which addressed many of the committee’s concerns. In November 2018, ERG identified several procedural elements which could be simplified, and raised concerns with definitions and inconsistencies. In February 2019, INFO submitted another revision addressing ERG’s comments. ERG shared several minor corrections with INFO, and the College worked on addressing these concerns during the Fall 2019 semester.
In conjunction with its Plan review, INFO revised both its appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) and appointment, evaluation, and promotion (AEP) policies. The Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed the policies and sent feedback to INFO in February 2013 related to terms, quorum requirements, and subcommittee composition. In Spring 2019, Faculty Affairs reviewed the APT and AEP policies again and provided feedback in December 2019. INFO addressed the committee’s concerns, and the APT and AEP policies were approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee in an email vote concluding on March 24, 2020. In addition, in February 2020, the Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed provisions for post-tenure review and provided INFO feedback on missing information. INFO submitted a revised post-tenure review policy to the committee in March 2020.

On March 31, 2020, the ERG Committee voted to approve the revised Plan contingent on the addition of clarifying language, approval by the INFO College Assembly, and approval of the post-tenure review policy by the Faculty Affairs Committee. The INFO College Assembly approved the revised Plan on May 1, 2020. The Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed the revisions to the INFO post-tenure review policy and voted to approve the policy on September 18, 2020.

**ALTERNATIVES**

The Senate could reject the revised Plan of Organization and the existing Plan would remain in effect.

**RISKS**

There are no risks to the University in adopting this recommendation.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no known financial implications in adopting this recommendation.
Revisions to the College of Information Studies Plan of Organization

BACKGROUND

The University of Maryland Plan of Organization for Shared Governance mandates that all Colleges, Schools, and the Libraries be governed by a Plan of Organization. These Plans must conform to provisions and principles set forth in the University’s Plan, the Bylaws of the University Senate, and the Policy on Shared Governance in the University System of Maryland, as well as with best practices in shared governance. Revisions to the Plan of Organization of each College, School, and the Libraries must be reviewed and approved by the University Senate. The Senate Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee is the standing committee responsible for conducting these reviews. The College of Information Studies (INFO) submitted a revised Plan of Organization in December 2012.

COMMITTEE WORK

In Spring 2013, the ERG Committee conducted an in-depth assessment of the revised Plan and provided feedback to INFO in May 2013. The committee requested that INFO clarify membership categories, constituencies, and election processes for the College Assembly and standing committees; ensure uniform procedures in the selection of members; and provide for student representation on shared governance bodies from all units which have faculty representation.

INFO returned a revised Plan in December 2014. ERG reviewed the draft Plan and returned comments in early April 2015. The committee requested additional clarification on committee types; committee membership and constituencies in the Dean’s Advisory Committee, College Assembly, and standing committees; and voting rights and procedures for administrative committees. Later that month, the committee met with representatives of INFO to discuss the revised Plan. INFO agreed to changes to resolve the committee’s concerns. In September 2017, the Chair and Coordinator met with the Dean and the Senior Associate Dean of INFO to align expectations and establish a timeline for completing revisions.

In March 2018, ERG received a new draft Plan. The committee noted ambiguous, contradictory, or missing language in provisions for the INFO College Assembly and various committees, including details regarding term lengths, quorum, and voting eligibility. The committee found several
instances where meaningful participation was unnecessarily restricted. The draft Plan also failed to distinguish between undergraduate and graduate students, and provided part-time tenured/tenure-track faculty greater representation than part-time PTK faculty or part-time staff. The committee provided feedback in May 2018.

In October 2018, INFO returned a new draft which addressed many of the committee’s concerns. A subcommittee reviewed the draft, which was discussed at the full committee meeting in November 2018. The committee noted that INFO’s revised definitions introduced some additional ambiguities, and identified several procedural elements which could be simplified. The committee expressed concern over the number of shared governance bodies appointed by the Dean rather than elected or chosen by a representative body, and noted an inconsistency with Robert’s Rules of Order. Finally, ERG recommended that INFO adopt language allowing for the appointment of replacement College Assembly members. ERG provided this feedback in November 2018.

In February 2019, INFO submitted another revision which addressed ERG’s previous comments regarding shared governance by reframing two of its committees as administrative, and indicating that the Parliamentarian may only participate in votes taken by secret ballot. ERG shared several minor corrections with INFO, and the College worked on addressing these concerns during the Fall 2019 semester.

In conjunction with its Plan review, INFO also revised both its appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) and appointment, evaluation, and promotion (AEP) policies. The APT policy was shared with the Faculty Affairs Committee in February 2013, and assigned to a subcommittee, which presented its recommendations to the full committee later that month. The Faculty Affairs Committee requested that INFO clarify terms and include quorum information. The committee also expressed concern over the composition of subcommittees. The committee voted to send these suggestions back to INFO for revision.

In Spring 2019, a subcommittee of Faculty Affairs reviewed the APT and AEP policies. The AEP policy was shared with the committee in May 2019. The committee noted missing information in the APT policy regarding promotion criteria and processes, the role of the chair, notification processes, and confidentiality. The AEP policy lacked information on mentoring plans, promotional reviews, and College-level awards. The Faculty Affairs Committee provided feedback on the policies in December 2019. INFO addressed the committee’s concerns, and the APT and AEP policies were approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee in an email vote concluding on March 24, 2020.

In February 2020, the Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed provisions for post-tenure review that are required by the University of Maryland Policy on Periodic Evaluation of Faculty Performance (II-1.20[A]), and provided INFO with feedback. The committee noted that policy lacked information on the Merit Pay Review Process, and the review committee’s appraisal and criteria. INFO submitted a revised post-tenure review policy to the Faculty Affairs Committee in March 2020.

On March 31, 2020, the ERG Committee voted to approve the revised plan contingent on the addition of clarifying language, approval by the INFO College Assembly, and approval of the post-tenure review policy by the Faculty Affairs Committee. The INFO College Assembly approved the revised Plan on May 1, 2020. The Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed the revisions to the INFO post-tenure review policy and voted to approve the policy on September 18, 2020.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The Elections, Representation, & Governance Committee recommends that the Senate approve the revised Plan of Organization for the College of Information Studies.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 — 2010 INFO Plan of Organization
Plan of Organization of the
College of Information Studies – UMD's iSchool
May 2020
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PREAMBLE

The Plan of Organization (the Plan) and other policy documents for the College of Information Studies (the College) establish the basic framework necessary for the College to fulfill its mission in an orderly and fair manner with due regard to the shared rights, responsibilities, and participation of the entire College community. The Plan addresses specific details of the College’s organization, and is consistent with the policies, procedures, and regulations for shared governance at the University of Maryland, as set forth in the University Plan of Organization. At the same time, the Plan acknowledges the executive authority of the Dean(s) of the College, who derive their authority from the Provost.

The Plan establishes a non-departmental structure that supports the collegiality of the College. It creates a framework designed to facilitate cooperation and collaboration of the entire College community in all aspects of the College’s mission. It is meant to ensure that academic
and professional growth may be pursued in an atmosphere of stability, freedom, inclusion, and trust.

ARTICLE I – MISSION

The College engages in collaborative, interdisciplinary, and innovative research, teaching, and service. The College educates information professionals and scholars, and creates knowledge, systems, and processes to promote the effective management and use of information.

ARTICLE II – SHARED GOVERNANCE

Governance of the College is shared among administrators, faculty, staff, and students. Administrators are responsible for seeking advice, initiating action, making decisions, and implementing policy, as well as for ensuring accountability for their actions. Administrative accountability requires active accounting to other constituencies with whom governance is shared. Faculty members have the responsibility for informed and regular participation in governance activities related to all aspects of the academic mission of the College. Staff members have a vital role in support of the College’s mission and have the responsibility for regular and informed participation in governance activities. Students have the right to and responsibility for informed and regular participation in governance activities, especially those that impact their areas of interest.

ARTICLE III – COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

A. The Dean

1. Appointment and Terms

Members of the College Assembly, as defined in Article VII, shall participate in the appointment of the Dean as specified in campus procedures. The Dean shall be appointed for a five-year term and reviewed in compliance with University policies.

2. Duties and Responsibilities

The Dean shall be the chief academic and administrative officer of the College. The Dean shall be responsible for professional and academic leadership, College business operations, and liaising with the campus community and the professions served by the College. The Dean shall provide leadership in maintaining accreditation of the degree programs offered by the College. The Dean shall be the chief advocate for the College and shall be responsible for the College’s budgets and resources, for fundraising, and for reviewing and recommending campus-level proposals made by the College Assembly and the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee. The Dean reports to the Provost.
B. Associate Deans

1. Appointment and Terms

Associate Deans are appointed by the Dean, generally for three-year terms, and may be reappointed. Faculty, as defined in Article IV, may serve as Associate Deans.

2. Duties and Responsibilities

Associate Deans report to the Dean and shall be responsible for all tasks delegated by the Dean. Associate Deans may oversee academic programs, operations, and priorities of the College.

C. Academic Program Directors

1. Appointment and Terms

Academic Program Directors are appointed by the Dean, generally for three-year terms, and may be reappointed.

2. Duties and Responsibilities

Academic Program Directors report to the Dean, or their delegate, and shall be responsible for all tasks delegated to them by the Dean.

D. Diversity and Inclusion Officer

The Diversity and Inclusion Officer is appointed by the Dean and is primarily responsible for coordinating, monitoring, and evaluating diversity efforts in the College and carrying out other responsibilities as assigned by the Dean.

E. Other Academic Administrators

The College may have Assistant Deans, a Technology Officer, a Director of Academic Programs, a Director of Student Services, and other administrative officers as necessary.

Academic administrators shall perform those duties assigned to them by the Dean. Appointments for administrative positions shall follow the relevant University procedures.

ARTICLE IV – FACULTY

A. Membership
Unless otherwise noted, for the purposes of this Plan, full-time faculty shall include those persons who hold tenured/tenure-track and professional track academic appointments in the University of 50 percent time or more and an academic appointment in the College that is greater than 0%, and who are not candidates for a degree in the College.

All other persons, regardless of title, who hold paid academic appointments in the College shall be classified as part-time faculty.

B. Titles

In accordance with University policies, full-time and part-time faculty members may hold those titles set forth in the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty (http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/docs/II-100A.pdf).

C. Duties and Responsibilities

Full-time faculty shall be responsible for formulating and recommending educational policy and for teaching, research, creative work, and service activities of the College, as set forth in the faculty member’s written terms of employment and in accordance with University policies. They shall consider and deliberate questions of College governance and advise the Dean on matters pertaining to the College’s vision, mission, goals, and objectives.

Part-time faculty may participate in formulating and recommending educational policy and in teaching, research, creative work, and service activities of the College, as set forth in the faculty member’s written terms of employment and in accordance with University policies. They may consider and deliberate questions of College governance and advise the Dean on matters pertaining to the College’s vision, mission, goals, and objectives.

ARTICLE V – STAFF

A. Membership

The staff shall include all full-time and part-time, exempt and non-exempt, administrative personnel holding professional and support positions within the College, who do not hold teaching or research appointments. Exempt staff may hold titles such as Coordinator or Advisor, or other titles as defined by the University.

B. Duties and Responsibilities

Staff have the right to and responsibility for informed and regular participation in governance activities, especially those that impact their areas of interest. As appropriate, exempt and non-exempt staff shall be responsible for advising on and supporting educational policy and for teaching, research, creative work, and service activities of the College, as set forth in the staff member’s written terms of employment and in accordance with University policies.
ARTICLE VI – STUDENTS

A. Membership

Students shall include all undergraduate and graduate, full-time and part-time, students who are enrolled and in good standing in the approved academic programs of the College.

B. Duties and Responsibilities

Students have the right to participate in governance activities, especially those that impact their areas of interest.

ARTICLE VII – COLLEGE ASSEMBLY

A. Membership

The voting members of the College Assembly shall include all full-time faculty and full-time exempt and non-exempt staff. The Dean shall be an ex-officio, voting member of the Assembly.

One part-time faculty member shall be elected as a voting member by the part-time faculty to represent the interests of this group. Nominations for part-time faculty to serve in this capacity shall be solicited each spring via email, and all eligible part-time members can participate in this annual election process. The elections should be completed no later than May 1st. All other part-time faculty shall have voice but no vote in College Assembly meetings.

One part-time exempt or non-exempt staff member shall be elected as a voting member by the part-time staff, to represent the interests of this group. Nominations for part-time staff members to serve in this capacity shall be solicited each spring via email, and all part-time exempt and non-exempt staff members can participate in this annual election process. The elections should be completed no later than May 1st. All other part-time exempt and non-exempt staff members shall have voice but no vote in College Assembly meetings.

Students enrolled in each undergraduate and graduate degree program shall be represented by one student elected by the students in that program and that student shall have voting privileges. The student representative must be elected from among all current students in the respective degree program who are not on academic probation. The elections should be completed no later than October 1st. If an elected student is put on academic probation during their term, the appropriate Academic Program Director shall appoint a replacement student representative for the program.

Elected members serve one-year terms and may serve no more than two full, successive terms. Individuals are eligible for re-election after a break in service of one year.

B. Duties and Responsibilities
The College Assembly shall represent the faculty, staff, and students of the College and shall serve as its policy-making body. The College Assembly shall formulate, approve, and review educational and other policies specific to the College, including recommendations for the revision or creation of programs, tracks, Specializations, and certificates. The College Assembly shall also consider slates of members for standing committees created by the Nominating Committee. The College Assembly shall discuss and/or initiate action deemed necessary or advisable by the Dean, Associate Deans, Academic Program Directors, chairs of standing committees, or any member of the College Assembly. It shall regularly review the strategic plan of the College and recommend and approve changes. It shall perform any other functions as prescribed by the Plan.

C. Officers of the Assembly

The Chair of the College Assembly shall convene and preside over all regular and special meetings of the College Assembly; develop the agenda for each meeting in consultation with the Dean and members of the College Assembly; and distribute by electronic means a written agenda and other documents as appropriate to each member of the College Assembly at least two days prior to each meeting.

The Secretary of the College Assembly shall be responsible for the minutes of all College Assembly meetings; prepare drafts of the minutes from the previous meeting to be distributed with the agenda for the next College Assembly meeting; and, after review and approval by the Assembly, post minutes from each meeting so that they can be accessed by all members of the College Assembly. The Secretary also shall maintain a roster of the members of the College Assembly present at each regular and special meeting. In the absence of the Chair or the Parliamentarian of the College Assembly at any College Assembly meeting, the Secretary shall assume the duties and responsibilities identified for the absent Officer.

The Parliamentarian of the College Assembly advises the Chair on parliamentary procedure during meetings and informs the Chair of the College Assembly of errors in parliamentary procedure if they affect the basic rights of members of the College Assembly. The individual elected Parliamentarian of the College Assembly should have expertise in parliamentary procedure and sits next to the presiding officer during meetings. In the absence of the Secretary of the College Assembly at any College Assembly meeting, the Parliamentarian shall assume the duties and responsibilities of the Secretary. The Parliamentarian shall be a non-voting member of the Assembly except in the case of a ballot vote.

D. Election and Removal Process

At the first meeting held during the spring semester, the members of the Assembly shall elect a Nominating Committee, which shall present a slate of candidates as set forth in Article VIII.D.2(a). At the following meeting, the Nominating Committee shall then present to the Assembly, in writing, a slate of candidates. At the last meeting in the spring semester, additional
nominations may be made from the floor, and an election will be held. The terms of successful candidates begin on July 1 and end on June 30 of the following year.

If a vacancy in the position of Chair or Secretary of the College Assembly occurs during the academic year, a special election shall be held at the next meeting of the College Assembly. The Dean will solicit nominations for the vacant position from the floor and a ballot vote will be held.

The Chair, the Secretary, and the Parliamentarian of the College Assembly are each elected for a one-year term. The Chair and the Secretary may serve no more than two full, successive terms. The Chair, the Secretary, and the Parliamentarian may be removed for cause by a two-thirds vote of the College Assembly. The Dean of the College is not eligible to serve as the Chair or Secretary of the Assembly.

E. Regular Meetings

The College Assembly shall meet at least once during the fall and spring semesters.

Any meeting of the Assembly, whether regular or special, shall be preceded by at least ten (10) days electronic notice to all members. This notice shall include a request for agenda items and a statement that any such requests must be submitted to the Chair of the Assembly no later than one week preceding the meeting.

The Assembly may meet in person, use synchronous collaboration systems (e.g., teleconferencing), or any fully connected combination of the two. Minutes shall be taken at every meeting of the College Assembly.

A simple majority of the voting membership shall constitute a quorum. Faculty on paid or unpaid leave and faculty on sabbatical shall not be considered when determining the quorum, unless the faculty member has informed the Chair, in writing, of their intent to participate in a meeting of the College Assembly. No vote shall be taken in absence of a quorum.

In exceptional circumstances, when it would not be feasible to assemble a quorum in other ways, voting may be conducted by asynchronous systems (e.g., email). In these circumstances, the Chair may request a vote only following a separate and announced discussion period of at least twenty-four (24) hours, which may also be conducted by asynchronous systems. A voting period of at least twelve (12) hours shall commence at the end of the discussion period. The existence of a quorum shall be determined by the total number of eligible respondents whose votes are received by the deadline specified by the Chair.

Appropriate provisions shall be made to preserve confidentiality of individual votes, regardless of the manner in which the vote is conducted.

Proposals that may require a vote must be presented in writing and shall be submitted to the Chair of College Assembly no later than one week preceding the College Assembly at which the issue is to be presented.
Meetings of the College Assembly shall be conducted in accordance with Robert’s Rules of Order, Newly Revised.

All meetings of the College Assembly shall be open to observers.

F. Special Meetings

Special meetings of the College Assembly may be called at any time 1) by the Chair of College Assembly, or 2) upon written petition of a majority of the voting membership and delivery of the petition to the Chair of College Assembly. The petitioners shall present with their petition a proposed agenda for the meeting, which shall be the only order of business at the meeting. Special meetings must follow the notification procedures set forth for regular meetings in Article VII.E.

ARTICLE VIII - COMMITTEES

A. General Provisions Governing Committees

1. Terms

The term of each committee shall begin on July 1 and end on June 30 of the following year.

2. Duties and Responsibilities

In addition to specific functions outlined in the Plan, each committee shall perform any additional functions delegated by the College Assembly or as requested by the Dean.

3. Meetings

   a. Committees normally meet during the fall and spring semesters.

   b. All committee meetings shall be open, except those dealing with the appointment, promotion, or tenure of faculty (as further described in Section D.2(e) of this Article) or those addressing issues pertaining to individual students or applicants to the College.

   c. Agendas for and minutes of meetings shall be posted so that all members of all relevant stakeholder groups can access them.

   d. Unless otherwise specified, committees may meet in person, use synchronous collaboration systems (e.g., teleconferencing), use asynchronous systems (e.g., email), or any combination thereof.
e. A simple majority of the voting membership of each committee shall constitute a quorum.

f. Unless otherwise specified, the Chair of the committee shall be elected by and from the members of the committee. The Chair shall vote only to break a tie.

g. No votes shall be taken in absence of a quorum.

h. A vote may be taken by voice, show of hands, ballot, or other mechanism specified in *Robert’s Rules of Order, Newly Revised*.

i. For meetings held via asynchronous systems, the Chair, at their discretion, may require a discussion period before a vote is held. During this discussion period, the Chair, at the request of any member of the committee, shall postpone a vote until the committee meets in person. The existence of a quorum shall be determined by the total number of eligible respondents whose votes are received by the deadline specified by the Chair.

j. Appropriate provisions shall be made to preserve confidentiality of individual votes.

k. Minutes are required, regardless of the manner in which the meeting or vote is conducted.

4. Formation of Subcommittees

Any committee may form subcommittees to conduct its business, unless prohibited by College or University policies. Members of subcommittees need not be members of the parent committees or the College Assembly. Actions taken by subcommittees or others designated to engage in the work of the committee are subject to review by and approval of the full committee.

B. College Advisory Committee

1. Purpose

The College Advisory Committee is intended to fulfill the requirements of the Faculty Advisory Council, as set forth in Article 11 of the University Plan of Organization.

2. Membership

The Committee shall be comprised of one member from each of the following constituencies: Tenure-Track/Tenured faculty (one Full Professor, one Associate Professor, and one Assistant Professor), Professional Track faculty (one each from the Research, Teaching/Instructional faculty, and Faculty Specialist tracks) and Staff. Associate and Assistant Deans serve as ex-officio, non-voting members of the Committee. The Committee shall elect its own Chair. The Chair shall only vote to break a tie.
3. Election Process

The Nominating Committee shall prepare the slate of candidates. Full-time faculty and staff members of the College Assembly may vote on the slate of candidates.

Elections may occur at a meeting of the College Assembly or via an asynchronous system, in accordance with Section A.3(i) of this Article. If a vacancy on the Committee occurs during the academic year, the College Assembly will hold a special election.

4. Duties and Responsibilities

The Committee shall consult, at least once a semester, with the Dean on matters of interest and concern to the College, including decisions regarding budgets and facility planning. The Committee shall report at least once a semester to the College Assembly.

The College Advisory Committee shall serve as the Committee on Committees and shall propose a slate of candidates from which the Dean may appoint members to Administrative Committees, and shall provide a slate of candidates from within the College from which administrators above the College level may appoint representatives to participate in the search, nomination, and review of the Dean of the College.

C. Administrative Committees

1. Membership

Unless otherwise specified, the membership of each administrative committee shall be determined by the Dean and the Associate Deans.

The majority of members of each standing committee shall be full-time faculty. Unless otherwise noted, committee members are appointed for a one-year term and may be reappointed.

There are no term limitations on: staff members, such as Program Coordinators and Academic Advisors, who serve as ex-officio, voting members of committees; and Associate Deans, Academic Administrators, and the Dean, who serve as ex-officio, non-voting members of committees.

2. Descriptions of Administrative Committees

a. Programs, Courses, and Curriculum Committee (PCC)

i. Membership
The members of the PCC will be the Director of Academic Programs (or equivalent Academic Administrator), the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (or equivalent position), the Academic Program Directors, and the chairs of any relevant ad hoc committee (as defined in Section E of this Article). The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (or equivalent position) shall chair the committee and shall vote only to break a tie.

ii. Duties and Responsibilities

The PCC shall be responsible for advising program committees about university regulations for the review, revision, and creation of programs, tracks, specializations, certificates, and courses. The PCC shall review all recommendations regarding programs, tracks, specializations, or certificates before the information is presented to the College Assembly for approval. PCC approval is required: 1) before new courses can be offered; 2) when courses are to be removed from the course inventory; 3) when Special Topics courses are recommended for conversion to permanent numbers; and, 4) for all substantial changes in the characteristics of an existing course. This approval must take place before the recommendations are submitted to the Vice President’s Advisory Committee (VPAC). Substantial changes are defined as changes in title, catalog description, prerequisites, grading method, credit level, course number, or learning outcomes.

b. Academic Program Committees

Academic Program Committees include, but are not limited to, the Bachelor of Science in Information Science (BSIS) Program Committee, the Master of Library and Information Science (MLIS) Program Committee, the Master of Information Management (MIM) Program Committee, the Master of Science in Human Computer Interaction (HCIM) Program Committee, and the Doctoral Program Committee.

Each Academic Program Committee may include one undergraduate and/or graduate student, as appropriate, to be elected by students enrolled either full-time or part-time in the College. The Dean shall appoint student members when vacancies occur during the academic year.

i. General Provisions

Each Academic Program Committee is chaired by the Academic Program Director and shall deal with issues specific to that degree program, including the recommendation of new course offerings (prior to approval by the PCC) and the regular review of courses and specializations. In cooperation with the Student Services Office (SSO) staff, the committee shall develop and review policies for the recruitment of students. Unless otherwise specified, each fall semester, the committee shall set admissions requirements and guidelines for the academic program and authorize the SSO to act on behalf of the Committee to review applications and admit students. The Committee or its designee shall review and approve or deny students’ petitions. The Committee or its designee shall review students in academic difficulty and make recommendations for remedial actions or refer students to the Committee on Students in
ii. Provisions specific to the Doctoral Program Committee

The Doctoral Program Committee shall develop and review policies and procedures governing the Doctoral Program and the courses offered specifically for doctoral students in accordance with the Doctoral Student Handbook.

The Committee shall evaluate applications for admission to the Doctoral Program and make recommendations to the Graduate School on acceptance or rejection.

The Committee or its designee shall review doctoral students in academic difficulty or who are failing to make progress toward Doctoral Program milestones and, in consultation with the student’s advisor, make recommendations for remedial actions or refer students to the Committee on Students in Academic Difficulty.

The Committee or its designee shall make decisions regarding scholarships, awards, or honors that may be given only to students in the Doctoral Program.

c. Committee on Students in Academic Difficulty

i. Membership

The Committee on Students in Academic Difficulty shall consist of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, the Director of Academic Programs (or equivalent Academic Administrator), the Directors of all academic programs offered by the College, and other appropriate Academic Administrators. It may include additional representation from academic program administration and Student Services. The Dean (or the Dean’s designee) shall chair the Committee on Students in Academic Difficulty and shall vote only to break a tie.

ii. Duties and Responsibilities

The Committee on Students in Academic Difficulty shall decide on dismissal of students from the College or the imposition of conditions that the student must meet to continue in the program in accordance with College and University policies and procedures pertaining to academic progress.

d. Awards, Scholarships, and Honors Committee

i. Membership

Members of the Committee shall include one tenured faculty member, one tenure-track faculty member, one professional track faculty member, and one exempt or non-exempt staff member.
ii. Duties and Responsibilities

This Committee shall select the recipients of awards, scholarships, and/or honors that are open to any student who is in good academic standing and who is currently enrolled in any of the degree program(s) offered by the College. As noted in Section C.2.b(i), decisions regarding scholarships, awards, or honors to be given only to students in one specific academic program will be made by the appropriate Academic Program Committee.

e. Diversity and Inclusion Committee

i. Membership

Members of the Committee shall include one tenured faculty member, one tenure-track faculty member, one professional track faculty member, one exempt or non-exempt staff member, and one student member elected from those students enrolled full-time or part-time in a degree program offered by the College. The Diversity and Inclusion Officer shall serve as the Chair of the Committee.

ii. Duties and Responsibilities

The Diversity and Inclusion Committee shall promote awareness of issues of diversity in the College community and the information professions through organizing events, publicizing diversity initiatives, and other activities. The Committee shall work to increase representation of diverse populations among the students, staff, and faculty of the College through recruitment and publicity efforts. The members shall represent the College to the University, the information professions, and the surrounding community through involvement in organizations and events focused on diversity. The Committee shall serve in an advisory capacity for the Information & Diverse Populations Specialization and shall coordinate the process for promoting the James Partridge Award and selecting the recipient thereof.

D. Standing Committees of the College Assembly

1. Membership

The majority of members of each standing committee shall be full-time faculty. Faculty and staff members may not serve for more than two successive, one-year terms on the same committee.

2. Descriptions of Standing Committees

a. Nominating Committee

i. Membership
The Nominating Committee is comprised of four members, the majority of which shall be full-time faculty. One member of the Committee shall be a full-time staff member. Members are nominated from the floor of the Assembly, typically at the March meeting. The Chair shall be elected by and from the members of the Committee.

ii. Duties and Responsibilities

Typically at the April meeting of the College Assembly, the Nominating Committee shall present a slate of candidates in writing for 1) the Chair, the Secretary, and the Parliamentarian of the College Assembly; 2) the College Advisory Committee; 3) the membership (including the Chair) of each Standing Committee, except as otherwise noted; and 4) one representative to the Graduate Council (who serves a three-year term), when applicable.

The Nominating Committee shall also coordinate the election of faculty representatives to the University Senate (when applicable) by soliciting nominations and facilitating elections, in accordance with Article 4.4a of the University Plan of Organization. The College’s Senators will be elected on an at-large basis, and elections for the upcoming academic year shall ordinarily conclude by February 1 to ensure newly elected Senators are eligible to run for elected committees and councils. If a vacancy in the position of Senator occurs during the academic year, a special election shall be held at the next meeting of the College Assembly. The Chair will solicit nominations for the vacant position from the floor and a ballot vote will be held.

b. Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

i. Membership

Voting members of the Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (the “APT Committee”) shall include all full-time faculty whose primary appointment is in the College. For all discussions; 1) the Dean has voice, but no vote, 2) Associate Deans who are full-time faculty members in the College are voting members of the APT Committee, subject to the conditions stated below.

A full-time faculty member whose primary appointment is outside of the College may vote on initial appointments, provided that they are at or above the rank of the appointment under consideration. In promotion and award of tenure cases, a full-time member whose primary appointment is outside of the College has voice, but no vote, provided that they are at or above the rank to which a promotion or award of tenure is being considered.

Part-time faculty, have voice, but no vote, on initial appointments.

The Chair of the APT Committee shall be a full-time, tenured professor in the College. Upon consideration of the candidate nominated by the nominating committee and any nominations made from the floor, the Assembly shall elect the Chair of the APT Committee.
As specified in the Procedures for Review, Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty (Appendix A) and the Procedures for Review, Appointment, and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty (Appendix C), faculty members at or above the rank to which an appointment, promotion, or the award of tenure is being considered are members of the APT Committee for the discussion and/or vote on that case.

For cases pertaining to an initial appointment, APT members who have voice, but no vote, may be present and participate during the discussion and voting process.

For cases pertaining to an appointment to rank or the award of tenure, only voting members may be present and participate during the discussion and voting process.

For the approval of policies that apply to all College faculty, voting members include all voting members of the APT Committee.

For the approval of policies that apply only to tenured or tenure-track faculty, voting members include only part-time and full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty. Full-time, professional track faculty have voice, but no vote.

For the approval of policies that apply only to part-time and full-time professional track faculty, voting members include all voting members of the APT Committee.

ii. Duties and Responsibilities

The APT Committee shall:

1) Establish policies for the appointment, review, promotion, and tenure of faculty. The APT Committee may establish subcommittees to perform specific tasks.

2) Conduct reviews of professional track faculty, in accordance with the Procedures for Review, Appointment, and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty (Appendix C).

3) Conduct reviews of tenure-track faculty, in accordance with Procedures for Review, Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty (Appendix A).

4) Conduct reviews of tenured faculty, in accordance with Procedures for Review, Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty (Appendix A).

   a) For Professors and Associate Processors after their sixth year in that rank, comprehensive reviews are normally conducted every five years. If a faculty member was on any combination of sabbatical leave, leave of absence, or University administrative assignment for one or more academic years, the post-tenure review will be delayed for the same number of years. If the faculty member is on a one-semester sabbatical leave or leave of absence in the semester in which the review would normally occur, the review will be performed during the following academic year. Comprehensive reviews for
Professors whose tenure home is in another unit will be conducted according to the policies of that unit.

b) The APT Committee shall elect a separate Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review Committee (CPTRC) for each comprehensive review. The CPTRC shall consist of three elected members, all of whom shall be Professors at the University. For faculty with a tenure home in the College who hold a paid joint appointment in one or more other units, one member should be from one such unit. When possible, at least two members of the CPTRC should hold paid College appointments. When fewer than two unconflicted College Professors are available for election, the APT Committee may appoint one qualified member from outside the College.

c) The faculty member being reviewed shall submit by October 15th a written report and a CV in the form required by the APT Committee. The written report shall focus on (1) research, scholarly, and creative activities; (2) teaching, advising, and other educational activities; and (3) service activities to the University, state, nation, professional community, or other organizations.

d) After receipt of the faculty member’s written report and CV, the CPTRC shall meet to consider the submitted materials and to discuss the case. The chair of the CPTRC shall then draft the appraisal report for each member of the Committee to review and edit. The appraisal report shall include a categorical ranking of Outstanding, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory. In the event that agreement cannot be reached, one or more members may submit separate appraisal reports. The CPTRC shall provide their final report to the faculty member by November 15. The faculty member may, at their option, prepare a written response to the Committee; any such response must be submitted by December 1.

e) The Dean and the faculty member shall meet, normally in early December, to discuss the review. When the members of the CPTRC are unanimous in assigning a categorical ranking of Outstanding, the Dean should publicly recognize the faculty member’s accomplishments; if resources permit, the Dean should consider additionally recognizing the faculty member’s accomplishments in a materially significant way (e.g., through the allocation of travel funds to support public outreach or exploratory research). When the members of the CPTRC are unanimous in assigning a categorical ranking of Unsatisfactory, and in such other cases as the Dean may determine are necessary, the Dean and the faculty member shall discuss and agree on a firm, written development plan for enhancing meritorious work and for improving less satisfactory performance. In such cases, the development plan must include a timetable and a procedure for evaluation of progress at fixed intervals.

The Dean shall prepare a brief, written report stating their final evaluation of the faculty member, provide the report to the faculty member, and forward the report—together with all materials submitted by the candidate initially and (optionally) in response to the report, prepared by the staff, or prepared by the Committee—to the Provost by February 1. In the event that the faculty member disagrees with the final evaluation, a written appeal may be filed with the Provost by February 15. In such cases, the Provost will
review the appeal and the materials forwarded by the Dean. The Provost will meet separately with the faculty member, and the Provost will then issue a decision, normally by April 15. The Dean will then forward the materials, including the Provost’s decision in the event of an appeal, to the Office of Faculty Affairs, normally by May 1. The Dean will also file a copy of all materials in the faculty member’s personnel file.

5) Make recommendations to the Dean regarding the appointment, contract renewal, promotion, and tenure of faculty. These tasks may not be delegated to a subcommittee, although subcommittees, administrators, or staff may be asked to prepare records that will serve as a basis for the committee’s deliberation. The Dean may participate in discussions, but shall not have a vote.

c. Annual Review Committee

The APT committee will elect the Annual Review Committee, usually during the Fall semester. The Annual Review Committee will consist of two Professors and two tenured Associate Professors. Each year, the Dean shall review the makeup of the Annual Review Committee over the previous five years to assure that a reasonable representation of faculty diversity has been achieved. If it has not, the Dean shall take appropriate action to rectify the situation.

The Annual Review Committee conducts the annual merit pay review for all faculty members with paid iSchool appointments, and contract renewal reviews for Assistant Professors at the end of their contract period (usually the end of the Spring semester in their third full academic year). The Annual Review Committee also conducts progress reviews for Assistant Professors and early-career Associate Professors.

d. PTK Review Committee

The APT committee will elect the PTK Review Committee, usually during the Fall semester. The PTK Review Committee will consist of four members, including one full Professor, one Principal or Senior Lecturer, one Associate or full Research Faculty member, and one Senior or Principal Faculty Specialist. Each year the Dean shall review the make-up of the PTK Review Committee over the previous five years to ensure that a reasonable representation of faculty diversity has been achieved. If it has not, the Dean shall recommend appropriate action to the APT to rectify the situation. The PTK Review Committee conducts 1) annual progress reviews for junior PTK Faculty who are not in term-limited appointments (i.e. Lecturers, Assistant Research Faculty, and Faculty Specialists), 2) biennial reviews for other PTK faculty who have not yet attained the highest position title in their series, and 3) the annual merit pay review for all PTK faculty.

E. Ad Hoc Committees

Ad hoc committees may be established by the College Assembly for specific tasks or activities. Each ad hoc committee will be given a charge that specifies its membership, procedures for selecting its Chair, quorum rules, and meeting frequency. The term of each ad hoc committee expires no later than one year after its creation unless extended by the College Assembly.
ARTICLE IX– STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

Students, as described in Article VI of this Plan, shall have the right to organize their own academic, professional, and extracurricular organizations.

If a student organization seeks to use the College’s name or identity, the College Assembly must approve its establishment, and a faculty member must agree to serve as advisor to the organization. If such an organization does not elect officers and/or hold meetings for one academic year, the College Assembly may vote to dissolve the organization.

ARTICLE X– REVIEW AND AMENDMENT

A. General Procedures

1. Recommended amendments to this Plan of Organization must be presented in writing to the Chair of the College Assembly, who will place the recommendation(s) on the agenda of the next regular meeting of the College Assembly, in accordance with the notice requirements set forth in Article VII.E.

2. Approval of a recommended amendment by a two-thirds majority of the College Assembly membership present shall constitute adoption of the amendment.

3. An amendment shall be adopted upon a two-thirds majority vote of a quorum of the Assembly, either in-person or via a synchronous collaboration system.

4. Following approval by the College Assembly, the revised Plan shall be submitted to the University Senate for review and approval.

B. Periodic Review

1. An ad hoc committee comprised of faculty, staff, and students shall be elected by the Assembly to review and make recommendations regarding amendments to this Plan at intervals of no more than ten years beginning in 2020.

2. Any revision to the Plan must be submitted to the University Senate for review and approval.
The College of Information Studies: Maryland’s iSchool

Procedures for Review, Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty, Professors of the Practice, College Park Professors, University of Maryland Professors

1. Scope

This document specifies procedures for the following reviews for tenure-track and tenured faculty members who have, or are candidates for, an iSchool appointment, including:

1) Review for initial appointment as Assistant Professor,
2) Pre-tenure contract renewal review for an Assistant Professor,
3) Review for appointment as, or promotion to, Associate Professor with tenure, appointment as Associate Professor without tenure, or the award of tenure to an untenured Associate Professor,
4) Regular progress reviews for Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professional Track faculty members who were hired with a contractual provision for automatic appointment to Assistant Professor upon earning a doctorate,
5) Periodic and Comprehensive reviews of tenured faculty,
6) Review for appointment as, or promotion to, Professor,

This document also specifies procedures for the following reviews for untenured faculty:

7) Review for appointment as Professor of the Practice
8) Review for appointment as College Park Professor or University of Maryland Professor
9) Review for appointment as Emeritus Professor or Emerita Professor

For faculty appointed in the iSchool on a paid partial appointment who have their tenure home in another unit, the iSchool’s report for promotion will be prepared as described in this document, but it will be advisory to the tenure home unit, and timelines will be adjusted to meet the schedule requirements of that unit’s process. For promotion and tenure reviews that require letters from external reviewers, the letters obtained by the faculty member’s tenure home will be used.

Procedures for review, appointment and promotion of all other faculty members can be found in the College of Information Studies Procedures for Review, Appointment and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty.

Criteria for all reviews covered by this document can be found in the iSchool Criteria for Review, Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty, a separate document which is approved by, and which can be revised by, the APT committee. These procedures and the criteria shall be posted on a Web site available to all tenured and tenure track faculty, and all tenured and tenure track faculty shall be informed of their availability at the start of their appointment.

2. Policies

The University of Maryland APT Manual and Guidelines is the controlling document for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure cases.
The iSchool Plan of Organization is the controlling document for the iSchool Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT). The iSchool APT committee is responsible for the annual faculty progress reviews, faculty appointments, faculty promotions, and for the award of tenure to faculty. Two unusual characteristics of the iSchool APT committee should be borne in mind when reading this document. First, the APT committee elects other committees as described below; although these are in essence subcommittees of the APT committee, they are referred to as committees. Second, only iSchool faculty members at or above the rank to which an appointment, promotion, or the award of tenure is being considered are members of the APT committee for the discussion and vote on that case. In other words, the membership of the iSchool APT committee adjusts automatically (as described in the Plan of Organization) to be appropriate for the matter at hand. The same provision extends to the election by the APT committee of record preparation committees and review committees – in such elections, faculty present for the discussion and that vote on the committee’s membership are limited to those who will be eligible to vote on the results of the committee’s work.

All eligible faculty members, as specified in the Plan of Organization, are expected
- to participate in meetings of the APT committee,
- to vote without abstention on matters before the committee, and
- to stand for election to committees elected by the APT committee, unless they are on sabbatical or other authorized leave, assigned to a full-time university position outside the College, subject to a conflict of interest, or unavoidably absent at the scheduled time of the APT committee meeting.

Faculty members who are on leave or assigned outside the College
- remain members of the APT during the period of their leave, and
- they may participate in APT meetings at their option.

In-person participation in APT meetings
- is required of all other members when possible,
- but remote participation in APT meetings and remote voting is authorized when necessary;
  - faculty needing to participate remotely must provide adequate notice to the chair of the APT committee to permit arrangements for remote participation and remote voting. The chair shall make suitable arrangements for remote participation in such a way that all participants can hear each other, and in such a way that the confidentiality and integrity of APT voting can be assured.

Neither advance nor proxy voting are authorized.
- Members who expect to be unavoidably absent (e.g., because of teaching obligations) and are not on leave or on assignment outside the College must inform the chair of the APT committee so that the reasons for absences can be correctly reported.

All reviews shall be conducted with reference to Criteria for Review, Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty (a separate document).

Conflicts of interest that arise from close personal relationships (e.g., marriage), unusually close financial relationships (e.g., business partners), thesis and dissertation advisor/advisee relationships, or a supervisory relationship in another unit of the University are recognized by the university in a diverse set of policies (e.g., those relating to faculty appointments and those relating to faculty participation in
outside employment). Ordinary professional and personal interactions (e.g., co-authoring, personal friendship, or professional disagreements) do not normally create a conflict of interest for the purposes of faculty review, appointment, promotion, or tenure. Faculty members who believe that they may have a conflict of interest on a specific matter should consult with the chair of the APT committee (or, in the case of the chair, with the Dean) before the APT committee meets to consider the matter.

Except as noted below (in the case of the Progress Review Committee), it is the responsibility of the iSchool APT committee chair to inform the APT committee of the existence (but not necessarily the nature) of a conflict of interest that makes a specific faculty member ineligible to participate in a specific matter. If a known conflict of interest makes the APT chair ineligible to participate in a specific matter, the Dean will inform the APT committee of that fact and the APT committee will elect an acting chair for that matter.

3. Appointment and Promotion

3.1. Initial Appointment to a Paid Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty Position

Every member of the APT committee, regardless of their rank or position type, participates in the campus interview, discussion, and decision for candidates for initial paid appointment in the iSchool (whether joint with another unit or not) as Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor. When a search committee has been formed, the search committee will initially brief the APT committee, but search committee members who are not members of the APT committee (e.g., student members) must depart prior to discussion among members of the APT committee.

The APT committee will conduct at least two votes for each candidate. The first vote is by all members of the APT committee. The second vote, conducted only after the results of the first vote have been reported, is limited to tenure-track or tenured faculty members. For candidates for Associate Professor without tenure, an additional vote limited to Associate Professors and Professors is required. For candidates for Associate Professor with tenure, an additional vote limited to tenured faculty members is required. For candidates for Professor, an additional vote limited to Professors is required. Additional votes beyond the second express an initial assessment of the qualifications of the candidate for a senior or tenured senior appointment; in the event a conditional offer of employment is made and accepted as Associate Professor or Professor, an additional review (described below) will be required.

3.2. Appointment as or Promotion to Associate Professor, or Award of Tenure to an Untenured Associate Professor

Timing: Offers of employment as Associate Professor, with or without tenure, are conditional on the award of that rank by the President. Review for initial appointment as Associate Professor will therefore normally need to occur expeditiously after a conditional offer has been made and accepted. Review for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure normally occurs during the Fall semester of the sixth full year after appointment as an Assistant Professor, although there are provisions for earlier or later reviews in specific cases. Review for the award of tenure to an untenured Associate Professor will occur at the time specified in their contract. When the review will be in the Fall semester, preparation of the case normally begins in May and the faculty vote is normally scheduled to occur in early November.
Materials: Faculty members are required to submit a personal statement, a c.v. in the University’s required format, a representative selection of publications, a teaching portfolio, University teaching evaluation summaries for any courses taught in academic units other than the iSchool since the previous promotion (or, in the case of initial appointments, for the last five years), citation statistics for published work, and (in a sealed envelope or as email attachment) eight or more recommended external reviewers. The final list of recommended external reviewers and drafts of all other materials should normally be submitted by May 1; final materials other than citation statistics and the teaching portfolio should normally be submitted on August 1; the final teaching portfolio and citation statistics should normally be submitted on October 1. It is important that the draft materials submitted on May 1 be in nearly final form, lacking only comments and updates, because schedules will preclude extensive review and comment on subsequent versions. Additionally, iSchool staff will prepare the required teaching evaluation summaries (both the per-section teaching evaluation summaries that include student comments for review by the committee and the statistical summary required by the University APT).

Record Preparation Committee: The APT Committee will elect one Record Preparation Committee (RPC) for each promotion or tenure case. The RPC will consist of an elected chair and two other elected members, all of who must be elected from faculty who will be (at the time of the vote) eligible to vote on the case. The candidate for promotion or tenure shall be given the opportunity to suggest to the APT a faculty member to chair their RPC. The Dean serves ex officio on the RPC with voice but no vote. To facilitate timely requests for letters from external reviewers, the RPC for a promotion or tenure case that will be voted on in the Fall semester should be elected no later than March 20. The time and location of each meeting of the RPC should be announced in advance to all faculty members who will (at the time of the vote) be eligible to vote on the case. A faculty member who serves in a mentoring role in a jointly appointed faculty member’s other unit(s) may participate with voice, but no vote. Any member of the APT who will (at the time of the vote) be eligible to vote on the case may silently attend. The review committee may, at its option, invite nonmembers to speak, but they will have no vote. The RPC will normally operate by consensus, but in the event of disagreement a simple majority will suffice. When operating other than by consensus on any matter (e.g., the selection of external reviewers, the choice of materials to send to external reviewers, or the content of any document), voting shall be by secret ballot, and the vote results shall be reported to the APT.

Process: The normal process is:
- The RPC will normally first meet in April to provide feedback on the draft materials, to select the external reviewers, and to make tentative selections of the representative publications to be sent to external reviewers. The chair will then obtain advance commitments from a sufficient number of external reviewers (normally three from the candidate’s list and three others chosen by the RPC).
- The RPC will then normally confer again by email or teleconference in July to review the final materials and to make the final selection of representative publications to be sent to external reviewers. Review packages will normally be sent in mid-August, with a requested response date of October 1.
- The chair will draft the Summary Statement of Professional Accomplishments and will submit that statement to the faculty member being reviewed by mid-September in order to provide at least two weeks for comments and, if the faculty member desires, filing a written response.

1 The University APT manual refers to the Record Preparation Committee as the “Advisory Subcommittee.”
• The review committee will then normally meet in October to review the letters from external reviewers and the teaching portfolio and to discuss the contents of the evaluative report. The chair will then draft an evaluative report, and the committee will then meet again no later than mid-October to review and approve that report.

• The entire tenure package will then be forwarded to the APT committee, which will meet to discuss and vote on the tenure case, normally in the first week of November. The RPC chair shall chair the APT discussion, record the results of that discussion, and record the votes. Voting shall be by secret ballot. Members of the APT must maintain absolute confidentiality in their consideration of cases, including the content of dossiers. Outside of APT meetings, members of the APT mat not discuss specific cases with anyone who was not eligible to be present for discussion of the case by the APT.

• The report will then be revised by the chair of the RPC to report the outcome of the vote and to make whatever other changes the APT may direct.

• The report will then be sent to the Dean, who will prepare an independent report.

• Within two weeks of the Dean’s decision, the Dean shall write a letter to the candidate informing them whether the recommendations made by the APT and the Dean were positive or negative, and the Dean shall include in that report the number of votes in favor, against, and abstaining, and shall summarize in general term the nature of the considerations on which those decisions were based.

• Subsequent handling of the case will then proceed as specified in the University’s APT manual. In the event of requests for information from higher levels of review, the request shall be transmitted to both the RPC chair and the Dean, and the RPC chair shall serve as spokesperson at higher levels of review.

3.3. Appointment as or Promotion to Professor

Timing: Consideration for promotion to Professor occurs in response to a request from the faculty member. Faculty members who wish to be considered for promotion to Professor are expected to inform the Dean by mid-December of the year prior to the academic year in which they wish to be considered. The review process then proceeds on the same timeline as for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

Materials: Same as for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

Process: Same as for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

3.4. Initial Appointment as Professor of the Practice

The title Professor of the Practice can be awarded to applicants who have achieved national or international prominence through practice and leadership. Appointments may be for as long as five years, are renewable, and do not include nor contribute to tenure.

Timing: New appointments may be considered at any time. Renewals should normally be considered in the Fall semester of the final year of the appointment.

Materials: For initial appointment, the required materials are the same as for appointment as Professor. For renewal, only a current C.V. is required.
Process: For initial appointment, the process for appointment to a Paid Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty position will be followed. For a renewal appointment, the individual will inform the Dean that they wish to be considered for an additional term no fewer than 180 days prior to the end of the existing appointment. Required materials for a renewal appointment must be submitted to the Dean’s Office at least 15 days prior to the scheduled APT review. For initial appointments, the full APT provides a courtesy vote. For renewal, Full Professors and those who hold the same title are eligible to vote.

3.5. Initial Appointment as College Park Professor or University of Maryland Professor

The titles College Park Professor or University of Maryland Professor can be awarded to a faculty member who would qualify for appointment as Professor, but for the fact that they are employed elsewhere. Appointment as College Park Professor or University of Maryland Professor is normally for a period of three years and is and is renewable. Neither title includes tenure.

Timing: New appointments may be considered at any time. Appointment terms will end on June 30 of the third June following the appointment. Renewals should normally be considered during the Fall semester of the final year of the appointment.

Materials: For initial appointment as a College Park Professor by an individual who is a Professor at the University of Maryland Baltimore, a c.v. in the University’s required format and a statement from the applicant describing how their background and experience will contribute to the mission of the College and the University are required. The statement must identify specific iSchool faculty members who can speak knowledgably about their background, expertise, and potential contributions to the College and/or the University. For initial appointment as a College Park Professor who is not a Professor at the University of Maryland Baltimore, or as a University of Maryland Professor, the required materials as the same as those for initial appointment as a Professor. For renewal, only a current C.V. is required.

Process: To appoint a University of Maryland Baltimore Professor as a University of Maryland Professor, no RPC is formed. The APT decision is informed by the submitted materials, and the chair will prepare the report of the APT committee discussion and vote. For all other appointments to the positions of University of Maryland or College Park Professors, the process is the same as for appointment as Professor. For initial appointments, the full APT provides a courtesy vote. For renewal, Full Professors and those who hold the same title are eligible to vote. Required materials for a renewal appointment must be submitted to the Dean’s Office at least 15 days prior to the scheduled APT review.

3.6. Granting of the title Emerita or Emeritus

Associate Professors, Professors, Distinguished University Professors, Professors of the Practice, (full) Research Professors, (full) Research Scientists, (full) Research Scholars, Principal Lecturers, and Principal Faculty Specialists who retire from the university with at least ten years of service may apply for Emeritus/Emerita status.

Timing: For retirements at the end of an academic year, candidates are asked to request consideration by the second Friday in March to permit an APT vote at an April APT Committee meeting.

Materials: An updated c.v. is required prior to consideration by the APT committee. There are also additional requirements, listed in the University APT manual, that are required before the University will process the request.
Process: Voting members are tenured faculty who are at or above the current rank of the retiring faculty member, Professional Track faculty who are in the same series (research faculty, lecturer, or faculty specialist) as a Professional Track faculty member being considered for emerita or emeritus status; and, when voting on emerita or emeritus status for Professors of the Practice or Professional Track faculty, Professors of the Practice. Members being considered for emeritus or emerita status may not vote on their own case. Other members of the APT may participate in the discussion with voice, but no vote. The chair will prepare a report of the APT discussion and vote.

4. Other Reviews

4.1. Annual Review Committee

The Annual Review Committee conducts the annual merit pay review for all faculty members with paid iSchool appointments, and contract renewal reviews for Assistant Professors at the end of their contract period (usually the end of the Spring semester in their third full academic year). The Annual Review Committee also conducts progress reviews for Assistant Professors and early-career Associate Professors. Merit pay and contract renewal reviews evaluate accomplishments, whereas progress reviews are developmental reviews intended to help faculty members achieve their next career milestone.

The Annual Review Committee will normally meet during the second half of the Spring semester. The APT committee will elect the Annual Review Committee, usually during the Fall semester. The Annual Review Committee will consist of two Professors and two tenured Associate Professors. To foster continuity, one member of the committee should be elected from among the members of the committee from the prior year. To foster broad engagement and a diversity of perspectives, all other members of the committee should be new each year so that as many different faculty members as possible will have the opportunity to review each junior faculty member before their tenure case is presented. No member of the committee should serve for more than two consecutive years. Faculty members who have been notified that they will be promoted to Associate Professor with tenure before the due date of the materials may be elected as members.

Each year, the Dean shall review the makeup of the Annual Review Committee over the previous five years to assure that a reasonable representation of faculty diversity has been achieved. If it has not, the Dean shall take appropriate action to rectify the situation.

The committee shall elect a chair from among its members at its first meeting. No faculty member may participate in a review for which they have a conflict of interest, as determined by the Chair; conflicts of interest for the chair will be determined by the Dean. In the event a member of the committee has a conflict of interest, the Chair (or in the case of the Chair, the Dean) shall appoint replacements as needed to reach a minimum of two voting members for each review.

If not already a member, the faculty mentor assigned to the faculty member having a progress review will normally also participate with voice but no vote. The Dean also serves ex officio on this committee with voice but no vote.

The Annual Review Committee will normally operate by consensus, but in the event of disagreement on the content of a letter or report to be forwarded to the faculty or on how faculty comments should be
incorporated in the final letter or report, a simple majority will suffice. When operating other than by consensus, voting shall be by secret ballot.

**Materials:** All tenured and tenure-track faculty members must provide a c.v. in the format specified by the University’s APT guidelines and complete an online summary of accomplishments during the prior calendar year. Assistant Professors scheduled for a progress review must additionally submit a research statement and a teaching statement. Associate Professors scheduled for a progress review must additionally submit a personal statement addressing teaching, research, and service. These materials will normally be due to the Dean’s office on the second Friday in March.

At least one week before the committee meets, the Dean’s office shall provide to each member of the Annual Review Committee the following input:

- A complete list of faculty members who are eligible for review by the Annual Review Committee, including for each faculty member: what kind(s) of review the faculty member is scheduled for, the percentage of effort as determined by the faculty workload policy, and any known conflicts of interest,
- The materials provided by the faculty member, and
- A teaching evaluation summary for each course taught by that faculty member and peer teaching evaluations since the most recent review.

**Progress Review Schedule.** Progress reviews are conducted:

- Each year for each Assistant Professor, for each Associate Professor without tenure, and for each Professional Track faculty member hired with a contractual provision for automatic appointment to Assistant Professor upon earning a doctorate.
- In the second, fourth and sixth years after the award of tenure for Associate Professor with tenure. Progress reviews for Associate professors with tenure satisfy the university’s requirement for comprehensive reviews of tenured Associate Professors, and results from such reviews are therefore forwarded to the Provost.
- There are three exceptions to these general requirements:
  - No progress review is conducted for faculty who are in their first semester at the time of the review,
  - No progress review is conducted for faculty in the year in which they submit an application for promotion or tenure, and
  - No progress review is conducted for faculty who have been selected for promotion but not yet promoted.

Progress reviews are conducted for all faculty with paid iSchool appointments, regardless of what fraction of their appointment is paid by the iSchool.

**Progress Review Process.** Professors who are members of the committee participate in all reviews; Associate Professors participate only in reviews of Assistant Professors. The faculty mentor will normally prepare an initial draft of the progress review letter, which should normally be about two pages before the meeting, and will update that draft afterwards. The letter should address research, teaching, and service, together with introductory and concluding comments. The draft letters will be edited for consistency by the Chair, and the edited draft letters will then be made available for comment by all tenured members of the APT committee above the rank of the faculty member being reviewed (except those with a conflict of interest) and the Dean for a period of at least one week. If comments are received, the Chair will share the comments with members of the review committee along with any changes made by the chair to the draft letter in response to those comments, and the members of the
review committee will be asked to approve (or further revise) the report. Upon approval, the letter will be forwarded to faculty member, the Dean, and all faculty above the rank of the faculty member being reviewed. Associate Professors may, at their option, prepare a written response to the review committee; any such response must be submitted within two weeks of their receipt of the report. The report and (in the case of Associate Professors) the materials reviewed by the committee shall then be forwarded to the Dean. After the report has been finalized (and after any written response has been filed), the Dean will then meet with each faculty member to discuss their report.

**Contract Renewal Review Process.** The same process will be followed as for a progress review, through preparation of the report by the Annual Review Committee, although the draft report may be somewhat longer than a typical progress review letter. The review committee shall then vote by secret ballot on whether the content of the draft contract renewal report is ready for presentation before forwarding the draft report to the APT committee, and the results of that vote shall be reported to the APT Committee. The case will then be discussed at a meeting of the APT Committee, and a vote on contract renewal by secret ballot will be conducted by the APT Committee. The report will then be revised by the chair of the Annual Review Committee to include the results of the APT Committee vote and to make any other changes that the APT may direct. After approval of the final form of the report by each unconflicted tenured member of the APT committee (which can be obtained by email), the report will then be forwarded to the Dean, who will make the final decision on contract renewal. The Dean will meet with the faculty member whose contract has been renewed to discuss their progress.

**Merit Pay Review Process.** The Annual Review Committee shall provide merit pay recommendations to the Dean based its evaluations of faculty members for: (i) teaching, advising and mentoring; (ii) research, scholarship and creative activity; and (iii) service to the profession, university and the iSchool. The Committee will determine faculty members’ degree of merit for each category, assigning a score on a 5-point scale for that category (where, 1=substantially below expectations, 2= below expectations, 3=met expectations, 4=above expectations, 5=substantially above expectations), taking into account any adjustments to the current workload policy that apply to specific faculty members. Subsequently the scores will be combined into an overall score by multiplying each score by the percentage of effort specified for that score for that faculty member to determine the overall level of merit.

To satisfy the university’s requirement for periodic evaluation of tenured faculty, the Annual Review Committee shall determine whether each tenured faculty member is or is not materially deficient in meeting expectations, and they shall include that determination in their written report. The merit pay committee will normally reach this judgment by determining whether the faculty member has been reported as being below expectations in the same area (teaching, research, or service) in both the current and the previous merit pay review, but the committee may also independently consider any factors specified in the iSchool’s Criteria for Review, Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty in reaching their judgment.

Committee members shall not participate in determining the degree of merit or the identification of material deficiencies for themselves, nor for other faculty for whom they have a conflict of interest.

A three-year moving average of merit ratings received over the most recent three years of evaluation (or less for faculty members who have not been evaluated for three years) will constitute the basis for determining merit increases in the current year. In years when merit funds are not made available, the Annual Review Committee will conduct merit review as a matter of record to provide ratings that will be used in subsequent years when funding is made available. If no merit pay is awarded for three or more
consecutive years, the moving average will be extended on a one-time basis in the first year when merit pay is again awarded to include all consecutive years in which merit pay was not awarded. Once merit pay is awarded, the system reverts to the three-year moving average for subsequent years.

The Dean allocates merit pay; the Merit Pay Committee advises the Dean. At least 80% of the merit pool shall be allocated by the Dean in a manner consistent with the ratings decided on by the Dean, as specified in this plan. Those monies will be distributed as a dollar amount. The remaining 20% of the merit pool may be used by the Dean, at his or her sole discretion, for solving special salary problems.

Following the establishment of the final ratings, the Annual Review Committee will meet with the Dean and discuss the ratings. The Dean shall, in a timely manner, conduct his or her own evaluation of each tenured and tenure-track faculty member using the criteria identified above. The final merit ratings shall be determined by the Dean. The assignment of merit pay (other than funds used by the Dean for solving special salary problems) shall take into account the final merit ratings, with appropriate allowances to ensure fairness in the case of faculty who receive merit pay from more than one unit (e.g., such that merit pay is proportionate to the percentage of salary received from the iSchool).

In years in which merit pay is available, the Dean shall prepare a confidential report to the Merit Pay Committee indicating his/her final decisions. The report shall include, for each faculty member, their final merit rating, and the amount of merit-based increases in the current year as a dollar amount. For faculty paid by more than one unit, amounts from other units need not be reported to the Committee. If funds are retained by the Dean for solving special salary problems, these amounts need not be reported to the committee individually, but the total dollar amount shall be reported.

After all salary adjustments for tenured and tenure-track faculty have been reviewed by the College financial officer, the Dean shall provide to each tenured and tenure-track faculty member a letter stating their new salary, the dollar amount of the salary adjustment, and the rationale for the merit and/or salary adjustments (including at least the Merit Pay Committee’s rating in each area, the aggregated rating assigned by the Merit Pay Committee for the current year and for each year included in the moving average, and the final merit rating assigned by the Dean). For faculty paid by more than one unit, the letter should (if mutually agreeable) be provided by the faculty member’s tenure home and should separately identify increases, if any, from each unit. The letter shall include a statement informing the faculty member of their right to meet with the Dean (and, where applicable, the head of any other unit from which the faculty member is paid) and to appeal his or her decision on their merit-based increase.

The Merit Pay Committee and the Dean may deviate from this plan only in the presence of extenuating circumstances. If there is a deviation, the Dean and Merit Pay Committee will present the deviation and rationale to the tenured and tenure-track faculty through written communication.

A faculty member may choose to appeal their merit pay allocation by sending a letter to the Dean within ten days of receiving his or her letter of notification of merit pay allocation. The letter must specify the faculty member’s basis for appealing. An Appeals Committee consisting of the Dean, the Merit Pay Committee, and one additional tenured faculty member appointed by the Dean, will review the faculty member’s request within 30 days. Two outcomes from the appeals process are possible: (1) no change in merit pay; or (2) the faculty member’s merit pay may be increased, with the increase awarded in the next year in which merit pay is available. A decision will be rendered by a simple majority
in a secret ballot of the Appeals Committee, and the decision of the Appeals Committee is final. The Dean will inform the faculty member in writing of the decision.

The Dean shall periodically evaluate the salary structure of the College and consult with the Provost to address salary inequities that have developed in the College.

4.2. Comprehensive Reviews for tenured Associate Professor and Professors

**Timing:** The University of Maryland College Park policy on Periodic Evaluation of Faculty Performance requires that a comprehensive review be conducted for each tenured faculty member no less frequently than every five years. For new Associate Professors with tenure, comprehensive reviews are conducted by the Review Committee using the procedures specified above. For Professors and Associate Professors after their sixth year in that rank, the procedures in this section apply and comprehensive reviews are normally conducted every five years. However, in the event that two successive merit pay reviews determine that a tenured faculty member who is reviewed under the procedures of this section is materially deficient in meeting expectations without an intervening comprehensive post-tenure review, that faculty member will be scheduled for a comprehensive post-tenure review in the subsequent academic year, regardless of whether five years have elapsed since their most recent comprehensive post-tenure review. Comprehensive reviews for Associate Professors and Professors whose tenure home is in the iSchool should be initiated by October of the fifth academic year after their most recent Appointment, Promotion, or Comprehensive Review (including comprehensive reviews conducted by other units during special administrative assignments outside the iSchool). If a faculty member was on any combination of sabbatical leave, leave of absence, or University administrative assignment for one or more academic years, the post-tenure review will be delayed for the same number of years. If the faculty member is on a one-semester sabbatical leave or leave of absence in the semester in which the review would normally occur, the review will be performed during the following academic year. Comprehensive reviews for Professors whose tenure home is in another unit will be conducted according to the policies of that unit.

**Process:** The APT committee shall elect a separate Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review Committee (CPTRC) for each comprehensive review. The CPTRC shall consist of three elected members, all of whom shall be Professors at the University of Maryland. For faculty with a tenure home in the iSchool who hold a paid joint appointment in one or more other units, one member should be from one such unit. When possible, at least two members of the CPTRC are required to hold paid iSchool appointments. When fewer than two unconflicted iSchool Professors are available for election, the APT Committee may appoint one qualified member from outside the iSchool.

The time and place of meetings of the CPTRC shall be announced in advance to Professors who hold paid iSchool appointments. Meetings of the CPTRC may be silently observed by any unconflicted Professor who holds a paid appointment in the iSchool. The iSchool Dean, and the senior administrator of any unit in which the faculty member holds a paid appointment, may participate with voice, but no vote.

The faculty member being reviewed shall submit a written report and a c.v. in the form required by the APT manual by October 15. The written report shall focus on (1) research, scholarly and creative activities, (2) teaching, advising, and other educational activities, and (3) service activities to the University, state, nation, professional community, or other organizations. There is no required format for the faculty member’s written report. The iSchool staff will provide the CPTRC with university teaching evaluation summaries (which include student comments) for all courses taught at the
University of Maryland by the faculty member being reviewed, and the confidential reports to the Dean of the merit pay committees, for each academic year since the most recent prior review. No letters from external reviewers are required.

The CPTRC shall normally meet in early November to consider the submitted materials and to discuss the case. The chair of the CPTRC shall then draft the appraisal report for each member of the committee to review and edit. The appraisal report shall include a categorical ranking of Outstanding, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory that is based on the iSchool’s Criteria for Review, Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty. In the event that agreement cannot be reached, one or more members may submit separate appraisal reports. The CPTRC shall provide their final report to the faculty member by November 15. The faculty member may, at their option, prepare a written response to the review committee; any such response must be submitted by December 1.

The Dean and the faculty member shall meet, normally in early December, to discuss the review. When the members of the CPTRC are unanimous in assigning a categorical ranking of Outstanding, the Dean should publicly recognize the faculty member’s accomplishments, and if resources permit the Dean should consider additionally recognizing the faculty member’s accomplishments in a materially significant way (e.g., through the allocation of travel funds to support public outreach or exploratory research). When the members of the CPTRC are unanimous in assigning a categorical ranking of Unsatisfactory, and in such other cases as the Dean may determine are necessary, the Dean and the faculty member shall discuss and agree on a firm written development plan for enhancing meritorious work and for enhancing less satisfactory performance. The development plan that is required in such cases must include a timetable and a procedure for evaluation of progress at fixed intervals.

The Dean shall prepare a brief written report stating the Dean’s final evaluation of the faculty member and shall provide that report to the faculty member and forward that report together with all materials submitted by the candidate initially and (optionally) in response to the report, prepared by the staff, or prepared by the committee, to the Provost by February 1. In the event that the faculty member disagrees with the final evaluation, a written appeal may be filed with the Provost by February 15. In such cases, the Provost will review the appeal and the materials forwarded by the Dean, the Provost will then meet separately with the faculty member, and the Provost will then issue a decision, normally by April 15. The Dean will then forward the materials, including the Provost’s decision in the event of an appeal, to the Office of Faculty Affairs, normally by May 1. The Dean will also file a copy of all materials in the faculty member’s personnel file. The Provost’s office will also maintain copies of all reports generated during the process. The same appeals process may be used by Associate Professors with tenure following a comprehensive review with which they disagree. In such cases, the Associate Professor must file their appeal within two weeks of being notified that their review materials have been forwarded to the Provost.
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PREAMBLE

The Plan of Organization for the College of Information Studies and other policy documents establish the basic framework necessary for the College to fulfill its mission in an orderly and fair manner with due regard to the shared rights, responsibilities, and participation of the entire College community. The plan addresses specific details of the College’s organization and is created to be consistent with the policies, procedures, and regulations for the governance of the University of Maryland.

The plan establishes a structure that is expected to enhance the collegiality of the organization. It creates a framework designed to facilitate cooperation and collaboration of the entire College community in all aspects of the College’s mission. It is meant to ensure that academic and professional growth may be pursued in an atmosphere of stability, freedom, and trust.

ARTICLE I – MISSION

The College of Information Studies engages in collaborative, interdisciplinary, and innovative research, teaching, and service. We educate information professionals and scholars, and we create knowledge, systems, and processes to promote the effective management and use of information.

ARTICLE II – SHARED GOVERNANCE

Governance of the College is shared among administrators, faculty, staff, and students. Administrators are responsible for seeking advice, initiating action, making decisions, and implementing policy as well as for assuring accountability for their actions. Administrative accountability requires active accounting to other constituencies with whom governance is shared. The faculty is responsible for informed and regular participation in governance activities related to all aspects of the academic mission of the College. Staff members have a vital role in support of the College mission and have the responsibility for regular and informed participation in governance activities. Students have the right to and responsibility for informed and regular participation in governance activities that specifically impact their areas of interest.
ARTICLE III – COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

A. The Dean

1. Appointment and Terms

Members of the College Assembly shall participate in the appointment of the Dean as specified in campus procedures. Members of the College Assembly shall take an advisory vote by secret ballot on the final list of candidates, and the result of this vote shall be communicated to the Provost. The Dean shall be appointed and reviewed in compliance with University policies.

2. Duties and Responsibilities

The Dean shall be the chief academic and administrative officer of the College. The Dean shall be responsible for professional and academic leadership, College business operations, and liaison with the campus community and the professions served by the College. The Dean shall provide leadership in maintaining the accreditation of the College. The Dean shall be the chief advocate of the College and shall be responsible for the units’ budgets and resources, for fund raising, and for reviewing and recommending campus-level proposals made by the College Assembly and the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee. The Dean reports to the Provost.

B. Academic Administrators

The College may have Associate and Assistant Deans and other administrative officers as necessary. Academic administrators shall perform those duties assigned to them by the Dean. Appointments for administrative positions shall be guided by University procedures.

ARTICLE IV – FACULTY

A. Membership

1. Regular Faculty

For the purposes of this plan, regular faculty shall include those persons, regardless of title, who hold academic appointments in the College of 50 percent time or more and who are not candidates for a degree in the College. Faculty members who have a joint appointment in two or more units shall be counted in the unit in which their tenure or primary appointment resides. In accordance with University policies, tenured or
tenure-track faculty members may hold the titles of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, or Distinguished University Professor. Faculty not eligible for tenure may hold the titles of Visiting Professor, Professor of the Practice, Research Professor, Lecturer, Affiliate Professor, or other titles included in the *University of Maryland Faculty Handbook of Policies and Resources* (http://www.faculty.umd.edu).

2. **Part-time Faculty**

Part-time faculty shall include those persons, regardless of title, who hold academic appointments in the College of less than 50 percent of time. In accordance with University Policies, part-time faculty may hold the titles of Adjunct Professor, Visiting Professor, Research Professor, Lecturer, Affiliate Professor, or other titles included in the *Faculty Handbook* cited in Article V.A.1.

**B. Duties and Responsibilities**

1. Regular faculty shall be responsible for formulating and recommending educational policy and for teaching, research, creative work, and service activities of the College in accordance with University policies. They shall recommend students for the award of degrees, as appropriate. They shall consider and deliberate questions of College governance and advise the Dean on matters pertaining to the College’s vision, mission, goals, and objectives.

2. Part-time faculty may be involved in formulating and recommending educational policy and in teaching, research, creative work, and service activities of the College in accordance with University policies. They may recommend students for the award of degrees. They may consider and deliberate questions of College governance and advise the Dean on matters pertaining to the College’s vision, mission, goals, and objectives.

**ARTICLE V – STAFF**

**A. Membership**

The staff shall include all administrative personnel holding professional and support positions within the school, who do not hold teaching or research appointments and who are not students within the College.

**B. Duties and Responsibilities**

As appropriate, the staff shall be responsible for formulating and recommending educational policy and for teaching, research, creative work,
and service activities of the College in accordance with University policies. When appropriate, staff members shall recommend students for the award of degrees. As appropriate, staff members shall consider and deliberate questions of College governance and advise the Dean on matters pertaining to the College’s vision, mission, goals, and objectives.

**ARTICLE VI– STUDENTS**

**A. Membership**

The students of the College of Information Studies shall include all individuals who are enrolled in the academic programs of the College.

**B. Duties and Responsibilities**

Students have the right to and responsibility for informed and regular participation in governance activities that specifically impact their areas of interest.

**ARTICLE VII – COLLEGE ASSEMBLY**

**A. Composition**

The College Assembly shall represent the faculty, academic administrators, staff, and students of the College and shall serve as its policy-making body.

**B. Membership**

1. The voting members of the College Assembly shall include all regular faculty, as described in Article IV.A.1, and academic administrators, as described in Article III.B of this Plan. Part-time faculty, as described in Article IV.A.2, shall be represented by one individual elected from among those persons, regardless of title, who holds academic appointments in the College of less than 50 percent of time during the current academic year. The Dean, as described in Article III.A., shall have voice but no vote in the Assembly.

2. Students enrolled in degree programs shall be represented by one student elected from each degree program (e.g., MLS, MIM, Ph.D., etc.) who shall have voting privileges.

3. Staff members who hold the title of Associate or Assistant Dean, Director or Officer within the College shall be voting members of the College
Assembly. One representative of other staff members shall be elected as a voting member by those staff members.

4. Other individuals from within the College may serve as voting members of the College Assembly if they are approved for membership by a two-thirds vote of the members of the Assembly.

5. All elected members of the College Assembly serve for a one-year term and may be re-elected.

C. Duties and Responsibilities

The College Assembly shall formulate, approve, and review educational and other policies specific to the College. It shall discuss and/or initiate action deemed necessary or advisable by the Dean, the College Council (see Article VIII), or any member of the College Assembly. It shall regularly review the Strategic Plan of the College and recommend and approve changes. It shall conduct elections of representatives to the College Park Senate and other University bodies in accordance with University regulations. It shall perform any other functions as prescribed by this Plan of Organization.

D. Elections of the College Assembly

At the March meeting, the members of the Assembly shall elect a Nominating Committee to select the Chair, the Secretary, and the Parliamentarian of the College Assembly, as well as chairs of all standing committees, for the next academic year. The slate of officers for the Assembly and standing committee chairs shall be presented in writing to College Assembly at its April meeting. Only regular faculty, as described in Article IV.A.1 or academic administrators, as described in Article III.B, may serve as Chair or Secretary of the College Assembly. At the May meeting, additional nominations may be made from the floor, and an election is held. If a vacancy in the position of Chair or Secretary of the College Assembly occurs during the academic year, it shall be filled by the College Council. The Chair, the Secretary, and the Parliamentarian of the Assembly are each elected for a one-year term and may serve no more than two full successive terms. The Chair, the Secretary, and the Parliamentarian may be removed for cause by a two-thirds vote of the College Council.

E. Chair of the College Assembly

The Chair of the College Assembly shall convene all regular and special meetings of the College Assembly; develop the agenda for each meeting in consultation with the College Council; and distribute a written agenda and
other documents as appropriate to each member of the College Assembly by electronic means at least two days prior to the meeting. The Chair of the Assembly shall serve on the College Council. The Chair of the Assembly shall cast a ballot in matters before the Assembly only in the case of tie votes.

F. Secretary of the Assembly

The Secretary of the Assembly shall be responsible for the minutes of all Assembly meetings; prepare drafts of the minutes from the previous meeting to be distributed with the agenda for the next Assembly’s meeting; and, after review and approval by the Assembly, post minutes from each meeting on the College’s Intranet. The Secretary also shall maintain a roster of the members of the Assembly present at each regular and special meeting.

G. Parliamentarian of the Assembly

The individual elected Parliamentarian must have expertise in parliamentary procedure and sits next to the presiding officer during meetings. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair on parliamentary procedures during meetings and informs the Chair of errors in parliamentary procedure if they affect the basic rights of members of the Assembly.

H. Regular Meetings

The College Assembly shall meet at least once during the fall and spring semesters. The Assembly may meet in person, use synchronous collaboration systems (e.g., teleconferencing), or any fully connected combination of the two. In exceptional circumstances, when it would not be feasible to assemble a quorum in other ways, discussion of issues and voting may be conducted by a synchronous systems (e.g., email). In these circumstances, a vote may be requested by the Chair only following a separate and announced discussion period. Appropriate provisions shall be made to preserve confidentiality of individual votes, and minutes are required, regardless of the manner in which the meeting or vote is conducted. A quorum is required for all votes, and voting by absentee ballot is not permitted when the vote is conducted by asynchronous means.

Proposals that may require a vote must be presented in writing and shall be submitted to the chair of College Council no later than the Council meeting immediately preceding the College Assembly at which the issue is to be decided. Meetings of the College Assembly shall be conducted in accordance with Robert’s Rules of Order, Newly Revised. A simple majority of the membership shall constitute a quorum. No vote shall be taken in absence of a quorum. All meetings of the College Assembly shall be open to observers.
I. Special Meetings

Special meetings of the College Assembly may be called at any time by any member, provided that the call is endorsed in writing by two-thirds of the membership.

ARTICLE VIII -- COLLEGE COUNCIL

A. Membership

The membership shall consist of the Dean of the College, who serves as chair; academic administrators, as defined in Article III.B.; the Chair of the College Assembly; the chair of each standing committee; and other senior administrators identified by the Dean.

B. Duties and Responsibilities

The College Council shall advise the Dean regarding priorities for current and projected allocations of financial, personnel, and other resources; resolve questions regarding the overlapping responsibilities among standing committees; make recommendations to the College Assembly regarding the creation, revision, or deletion of any College policy not otherwise specified in this plan; refer matters for consideration to the College Assembly or standing committees; set the agenda for College Assembly meetings; act on behalf of the College Assembly during the summer and winter terms and at other times when the College Assembly is not scheduled to meet; regularly review the Strategic Plan of the College and make recommendations for changes to the College Assembly; and regularly review the College Plan of Organization and make recommendations to the College Assembly regarding its revisions.

ARTICLE IX – STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Committee Chairs

The members of the College Assembly, at the March meeting, shall elect a Nominating Committee to select chairs of all standing committees for the next academic year. The slate of chairs is presented in writing to the College Assembly at its April meeting. Only regular faculty, as described in Article IV.A.1, or academic administrators, as described in Article III.B., may serve as chairs of standing committees. At the May meeting, additional nominations may be made from the floor, and an election is held. Vacancies that may occur during
the academic year shall be filled by the College Council. Committee chairs are elected for a one-year term and may serve no more than two full successive terms. Committee chairs may be removed for cause by a two-thirds vote of the College Council.

B. Membership

The membership of each standing committee shall be determined by the Dean in consultation with the elected chair of the committee, unless membership is defined in this Plan of Organization. The majority of members of each standing committee shall be members of the regular faculty as defined in Article IV.A.1 in this Plan. Committee members are appointed for a one-year term and may serve no more than two full successive terms on any committee. Each standing committee shall include at least one student member unless prohibited by College or University policies. The term of each standing committee shall begin at the beginning of the fall semester and end at the completion of the summer term. In addition to specific functions outlined in this Plan of Organization, each standing committee shall perform the administrative functions delegated by the College Assembly and the Dean.

Any standing committee may form subcommittees to conduct its business, unless prohibited by College or University policies. Members of subcommittees need not be members of the parent committees or the College Assembly. Any action of any subcommittee must be approved by the appropriate standing committee.

C. Regular Meetings

1. Standing committees normally meet during the fall and spring semesters.

2. All meetings of standing committees, except those dealing with the appointment, promotion, or tenure of faculty, or those addressing issues pertaining to individual students or applicants to the College, shall be open. Agendas for and minutes of meetings shall be posted on the College Intranet.

3. The Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure, and the Committee on Student Review must meet in person.

4. Standing committees, except those designated in Article IX.C.3. of this Plan, may meet in person, use synchronous collaboration systems (e.g., teleconferencing), or any fully connected combination of the two. In exceptional circumstances, when it would not be feasible to assemble a quorum in other ways, discussion of issues and voting may be conducted by asynchronous systems (e.g., email). In these circumstances, a vote may be requested by the chair only following a
separate and announced discussion period. Appropriate provisions shall be made to preserve confidentiality of individual votes and minutes are required, regardless of the manner in which the meeting or vote is conducted. A quorum is required for all votes, and voting by absentee ballot is not permitted when the vote is conducted by asynchronous means.

D. Descriptions of Standing Committees of the College

1. Programs, Courses, and Curriculum (PCC)

a. Membership

The members of the PCC will be the Dean or the Dean’s representative, the chairs of the Master’s Committee, the Doctoral Committee, the Undergraduate Committee, and the Professional Education Committee, the Technology Officer, and Associate and Assistant Deans (as defined in Article III.B.). The Dean or the Dean’s representative shall chair the committee.

b. Duties and Responsibilities

The PCC shall be responsible for advising program committees about University regulations for reviews, program revisions, and creation of new programs, tracks, specializations, and courses. The PCC shall review all recommendations regarding programs, tracks, specializations, or courses before the information is presented to the College Assembly.

2. Master’s Committee

a. Membership

The membership of the Master’s Committee shall be determined by the Dean in consultation with the elected Chair of the committee. The majority of members of the committee shall be members of the regular faculty as defined in Article IV.A.1 in this Plan. The Master’s Committee shall include at least one student member.

b. Duties and Responsibilities

The Master’s Committee shall deal with issues that are specific to the Master’s programs, including the approval of new course offerings and the regular review of courses and specializations. In cooperation with the Office of Admissions and Student Affairs, the committee shall develop and review policies for the recruitment of students. Each fall
semester, the committee shall set admissions requirements and guidelines for the Master’s programs and authorize the Office of Admissions and Student Affairs to act on behalf of the committee to review applications and admit students. The committee shall review Master’s students’ petitions. The committee also shall review Master’s students in academic difficulty and make recommendations to the Committee on Student Review on the dismissal of students from the College or the imposition of conditions that students must meet to continue in the program. The committee shall make decisions regarding scholarships, awards, or honors that may be given to students in the Master’s programs.

3. **Doctoral Committee**

   a. **Membership**

   The membership of the Doctoral Committee shall be determined by the Dean in consultation with the elected Chair of the committee. The majority of members of the committee shall be members of the regular faculty as defined in Article IV.A.1 in this Plan. The Doctoral Committee shall include at least one student member.

   b. **Duties and Responsibilities**

   The Doctoral Committee shall develop and review policies and procedures governing the Doctoral program and the courses offered specifically for Doctoral students in accordance with the policy manual for the Doctoral program. In cooperation with the Office of Admissions and Student Affairs, the committee shall develop and review policies for the recruitment of students. The committee shall evaluate applications for admission to the Doctoral program and make recommendations to the Graduate School on acceptance or rejection. The committee shall review Doctoral students’ petitions. It also shall review Doctoral students in academic difficulty and make recommendations to the Committee on Student Review on the dismissal of students from the College or the imposition of conditions that students must meet to continue in the program. The committee shall make decisions regarding scholarships, awards, or honors that may be given to students in the Doctoral program.

4. **Undergraduate Committee**

   a. **Membership**

   The membership of the Undergraduate Committee shall be determined by the Dean in consultation with the elected chair of the committee.
The majority of members of the committee shall be members of the regular faculty as defined in Article IV.A.1 in this Plan. The Undergraduate Committee shall include at least one student member.

b. Duties and Responsibilities

The Undergraduate Committee shall deal with issues that are specific to the Undergraduate programs, including the approval of new course offerings and the regular review of courses and specializations. In cooperation with the Office of Admissions and Student Affairs, the committee shall develop and review policies for the recruitment of students. Each fall semester, the committee shall set admissions requirements and guidelines for the Undergraduate programs and authorize the Office of Admissions and Student Affairs to act on behalf of the committee to review applications and admit students. The committee shall review Undergraduate students’ petitions. The committee also shall review Undergraduate students in academic difficulty and make recommendations to the Committee on Student Review on the dismissal of students from the College or the imposition of conditions that students must meet to continue in the program. The committee shall make decisions regarding scholarships, awards, or honors that may be given to students in the Undergraduate programs.

5. Professional Education Committee

a. Membership

The membership of the Professional Education Committee shall be determined by the Dean in consultation with the elected chair of the committee. The majority of members of the committee shall be members of the regular faculty as defined in Article IV.A.1 in this Plan. The Professional Education Committee shall include at least one student member.

b. Duties and Responsibilities

The Professional Education Committee (PEC) shall develop and review policies and procedures regarding the creation, presentation, and evaluation of non-credit and/or continuing education courses and make recommendations to the College Assembly regarding these programs.

6. Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure

a. Membership
The Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure shall be made up of two Subcommittees, the Subcommittee on Appointments and the Subcommittee on Promotion and Tenure.

b. Subcommittee on Appointments

i. Membership
The Subcommittee on Appointments shall consist of all regular faculty as described in Article IV.A.1 of this Plan and academic administrators and other College staff members who have been approved for teaching regular College courses by the Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure. Only tenured and tenure-track faculty may vote on the appointment of tenured or tenure-track faculty. Part-time faculty members, as described in Article IV.A.2 of this Plan, have voice but no vote. The committee shall be chaired by the Dean of the College.

ii. Duties and Responsibilities
The Subcommittee on Appointments shall approve the appointment of all proposed adjunct or other part-time faculty members, as defined in Article IV.A.2; shall make recommendations to the Dean regarding the appointment of tenured and tenure-track regular faculty members, as defined in Article IV.A.1; shall make recommendations to the Dean regarding the appointment or reappointment of non-tenure eligible regular faculty members; and shall approve requests for the appointment of Affiliate faculty. Voting on the initial appointment of tenured or tenure-track faculty shall be limited to eligible tenured and tenure-track faculty. To be eligible to vote, the faculty member must hold a tenure-track or tenured appointment in the University and must be at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks appointment. The Dean shall participate in the deliberations, but shall not vote. Members of the committee who hold the Ph.D. degree shall approve the appointment and reappointment of Research faculty.

c. Subcommittee on Promotion and Tenure

i. Membership
The Subcommittee on Promotion and Tenure shall consist of all tenured faculty members at or above the rank to which promotion is to be made. The Subcommittee shall be chaired by a person elected from its membership. The Dean shall participate in the deliberations, but shall not vote.
ii. Duties and Responsibilities

The committee shall function within the Policies and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure as approved by the College Assembly and in accordance with all University policies. Voting on promotion and tenure decisions is limited to regular, tenured faculty members at or above the rank to which promotion is to be made.

8. Committee on Student Review

a. Membership

The Committee on Student Review shall consist of regular faculty, as described in Article IV.A.1. of this Plan and academic administrators and staff who have been approved by the Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure for teaching regular College courses. The representative of part-time faculty members, as described in Article IV.A.2, has voice but no vote.

b. Duties and Responsibilities

The Committee on Student Review shall decide on dismissal of students from the College or the imposition of conditions that the student must meet to continue in the program in accordance with College and University policies and procedures. The Dean or the Dean’s designee shall chair the meetings at which students are reviewed.

ARTICLE X – OTHER COMMITTEES

A. Salary and Merit Committee

A Salary and Merit Committee shall be elected annually by the tenured and tenure-track faculty and shall include a distribution of faculty from the tenured and tenure-track ranks. The Salary and Merit Committee shall function in accordance with the Merit Pay Distribution plan approved by the regular faculty in a secret ballot as required by University policy VII-4.00(A).

B. Ad Hoc Committees

Ad hoc committees may be established by the College Assembly for specific tasks, for example, a Nominating Committee. The term of each ad hoc
committee expires no later than one year after its creation unless extended by the College Assembly.

ARTICLE XI – STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

Students, as described in Article VI of this Plan, shall have the right to propose to the College Assembly the establishment of College-wide student organizations or student chapters of professional organizations. The College Assembly must approve the creation of any student organization, and a regular faculty member must agree to serve as advisor to the organization. If an organization does not elect officers and/or hold meetings for one academic year, the College Assembly may vote to dissolve the organization.

ARTICLE XII – REVIEW AND AMENDMENT

A. General Procedures

1. Recommended amendments to this Plan of Organization must be presented in writing to the Chair of the College Assembly, who will place the recommendation(s) on the agenda of the next regular meeting of the College Assembly.

2. Approval of a recommended amendment by a two-thirds majority of the College Assembly membership present shall constitute adoption of the amendment.

B. Periodic Review

1. This Plan of Organization shall be reviewed every five years or less by the College Council.

2. Recommendations from the College Council for amendments or revisions of the Plan will be presented to the College Assembly in writing for approval.
Elevating our ERP system to the cloud at UMD.

Jack Blanchard
Associate Provost for Enterprise Resource Planning

Why Elevate?

Our obsolete ERP system can no longer meet the complex needs of a flagship research university.
Why Elevate?

Our obsolete ERP system can no longer meet the complex needs of a flagship research university.

Student Information System

New Jersey needs volunteers who know COBOL, a 60-year-old programming language.

State unemployment claims stalled by Eisenhower-era computer code COBOL.
What will we accomplish?

Goals of the Elevate Project

1. Provide a positive user experience for students, staff, and faculty.

2. Make the university more efficient and effective through simplified and streamlined business processes.

3. Allow the university to accurately collect, report, and analyze data.

4. Ensure data security and privacy.

5. Ensure that our ERP systems are reliable, can be easily maintained and regularly updated.
By centralizing functions such as . . .

Elevate will transform the way we do business

- Single Data Source
- Single System
- No down time.
- Mobile
- Regular Updates
- Enhanced Security
- Streamlined Integrations
- Dynamic Reporting
- Simplified Training
- Information Sharing
Elevating our ERP to the cloud with Workday.

Workday and other universities.

- University of Southern California
- The Ohio State University
- University of Virginia
- Iowa State University
- University of Washington
- Penn State
- Penn
- Yale University
- Georgia Tech
- The University of Texas at Austin
- University of Rochester
How will this get done?

Implementation is a Partnership

*Note – Huron has been selected for negotiations. Pending approval of contracts by BOR and BOPW.
When will this happen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017 - 2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review of UMD systems and cloud-solution options in higher ed.</td>
<td>HCM &amp; Finance Transformation and Implementation</td>
<td>Workstream 1</td>
<td>Workday Implementation</td>
<td>Process Transformation</td>
<td>Stabilization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Proposals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workstream 2</td>
<td>Student Transformation &amp; Readiness</td>
<td>Workstream 3A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform Implementation Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workday Adaptive Planning Implementation</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>Advancing UMD's Student Experience</td>
<td>Jumprstart to Workday Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review process:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workstream 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform Implementation Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Selections</td>
<td>Contract negotiations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sept-Dec 2020: Contract Approvals from Board of Regents Board of Public Works
What about COVID-19?

Adapting to COVID

• COVID-related challenges confirm our need for modern cloud-based systems that allow us to adapt and thrive.

• Postponed Elevate start date from August 2020 to January 2021.

• Implementation partner can do remote or “virtual” implementation.

• The Elevate project will be funded on internal sources through FY21.
Costs and Funding

Approximately $145 million over 6 years.

- Preliminary - negotiations are to be completed.
- Funding details are being determined but will involve UMD, USM and related entities using UMD’s ERP, and a student fee (in future years) that will need to be discussed and approved.

USM+ = USM and other campuses/entities using UMD’s ERP.

Who is involved in Elevate?
Who is involved in Elevate?

**Stakeholders**

- Students
- Staff
- Faculty

**Executive Sponsors**

- **Mary Ann Rankin**
  Senior Vice President and Provost
- **Carlo Colella**
  Vice President for Administration & Finance
- **Jeff Hollingsworth**
  Vice President & Chief Information Officer
Who is involved in Elevate?

**Steering Committee**

- **Jack Blanchard**  
  Associate Provost  
  Enterprise Resource Planning

- **Kelley Bishop**  
  Director  
  University Career Center & The President’s Promise

- **Joseph Drasin**  
  Senior Director  
  Enterprise Planning & Continuous Improvement

- **Barbara Gill**  
  Associate Vice President  
  Enrollment Management

- **Cynthia Hale**  
  Associate Vice President for Finance and Personnel

- **Axel Persaud**  
  Executive Director  
  Enterprise Engineering

- **Jewel Washington**  
  Assistant Vice President  
  University Human Resources

- **Chris Wilkins**  
  Assistant Vice President  
  Enterprise Resource Planning

---

Thank you!

Reach out with questions, suggestions

- jblancha@umd.edu
- erp-info@umd.edu

Elevate Website: Elevate.umd.edu
IV-1.00(A) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND REVIEW OF CENTERS AND INSTITUTES
(Approved by the President August 1, 1991; Amended xxxx)

I. Purpose

The University of Maryland encourages faculty, staff, students, and administrators to engage in areas of common interest. The creation of entities that help to organize and engage faculty, staff, and/or students from one or more disciplines around those interests may help to enable research, foster improvement of teaching, and/or enhance service to the State. To this end, the establishment, review, oversight, and termination of these entities will be guided by the procedures established in this Policy, in order to protect the legitimate interests of faculty, staff, students, and administrators while ensuring that the management of these entities is not burdensome.

II. Definitions

A. “Approval Authority” means the administrator with authority and oversight of the establishment, review, and termination of Centers and Institutes. Depending on the level at which the entity operates, the Approval Authority may be a Dean, multiple Deans, the Senior Vice President and Provost and/or the Vice President for Research, or the President.

B. “Center” means an entity that is comparable to an academic program without departmental status, which engages faculty, staff, and/or students in areas of specialized focus within one Unit or across multiple Units. A Center may be affiliated with an external agency and/or laboratory.

C. “College Level Center” means a type of Center that is typically composed of faculty, staff, and/or students from a single College and involves engagement from multiple departments or areas of focus within the College.

D. “Department Level Center” means a type of Center that is typically composed of faculty, staff, and/or students from a single department within a departmentalized College.

E. “Director” means the head of the Group, Center, or Institute.

F. “Group” means an informal collection of faculty members gathered to promote a common area of interest.

G. “Institute” means an entity with prominence and stature that is intended to have a level of permanence similar to that of an academic department. Institutes engage faculty, staff,
and/or students in areas of specialized focus within a College, across multiple Colleges, or University-wide. An Institute may be affiliated with an external agency and/or laboratory.

H. “Intercollegiate Level Center” means a type of Center that is typically composed of faculty, staff, and/or students from two or more Colleges and involves engagement from multiple areas of focus across the University.

I. “Multi-Institutional Center or Institute” means an entity created collaboratively between the University of Maryland and another institution, in order to advance the missions of both institutions or of the University System of Maryland.

J. “Unit” means an academic department, a College or School, or a Division.

K. “Unit Head” means the administrator or administrators responsible for a Unit. A Unit Head may be a Department Chair, Dean, multiple Deans, or the Senior Vice President and Provost and/or the Vice President for Research.

III. Policy

A. The University recognizes Groups, Centers, and Institutes as organizational entities intended to facilitate research, teaching, and/or service in alignment with a common interest.

B. Centers and Institutes must comply with applicable University and University System of Maryland (USM) policies. Centers and Institutes that receive federal funds must ensure compliance with federal regulations, including those regarding the conduct of research.

C. Centers and Institutes have a diverse range of financial models. The impact and returns on State and University resources are considered in their establishment and review.

D. Centers and Institutes have varied missions, and with few exceptions do not award degrees. If applicable, Centers and Institutes should foster relationships with academic programs to support the University’s educational mission.

E. Centers and Institutes may not grant tenure. New tenured/tenure-track faculty hires within a Center or Institute must be a joint appointment with an academic department.

IV. Entities and Levels of Organization

A. Groups

1. Groups may be short-lived, or may persist as the interest of the faculty develops.

2. Groups typically consist of faculty within one Unit but may include faculty from multiple Units.
3. Groups may use naming conventions including “Group,” “Research Group,” “Research Laboratory,” or other appropriate terminology, as long as the name does not improperly imply that the Group is a Center or Institute, as defined by this Policy.

B. Centers

1. Centers may operate within one Unit or across multiple Units.

2. Centers should have an independent budget that is largely supported by external funding, but may also include some level of State support.

3. Centers should have a formal administrative structure and should be headed by a Director who will report to the Unit Head.

4. Centers will be organized within the following levels:
   a. Department Level Center (DLC): The Unit Head for DLCs will be the Department Chair of the Unit in which the DLC resides. The Approval Authority for a DLC is the Dean.
   b. College Level Center (CLC): The Unit Head for CLCs will be the Dean of the College in which the CLC resides. The Approval Authority for a CLC engaged in research activities is the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Research. The Approval Authority for all other types of CLCs is the Senior Vice President and Provost.
   c. Intercollegiate Level Center (ILC): The Unit Head for an ILC will be specified at the time of its establishment. ILCs may report to one Dean, multiple Deans, or the Senior Vice President and Provost and/or the Vice President for Research, as appropriate to the level, structure, needs, and focus of the ILC. The Approval Authority for an ILC engaged in research activities is the Senior Vice President and Provost and Vice President for Research. The Approval Authority for all other types of ILCs is the Senior Vice President and Provost.

C. Institutes

1. Institutes may operate within a College, across multiple Colleges, or University-wide.

2. Institutes should have an independent budget that may be supported by external funding and/or State support.

3. Institutes should have a formal administrative structure and should be headed by a Director who will report to the Unit Head.
4. The Unit Head for an Institute will be specified at the time of its establishment, as appropriate to the structure, needs, and focus of the Institute.

5. The Approval Authority for an Institute is the President.

V. Proposal and Establishment

A. Groups

1. Groups may be established at any time with appropriate notice to the Unit Head of the department(s) or College(s) in which they reside.

2. The Unit(s) will be responsible for maintaining records of all Groups and providing information about the Group in departmental communications and on departmental websites.

B. Centers and Institutes

1. The establishment of a new Center or Institute must be guided by a formal proposal.

2. A proposal for the establishment of a new Center or Institute may be prepared by informal groups of interested faculty and administrators, a committee appointed for the purpose of determining the need, desirability, and feasibility of a Center or Institute, or any similar formal or informal group.

3. Proposers are encouraged to consult with the Division of Research as a resource when determining the long-term feasibility of securing external funds in a specific research area.

4. All proposals should include the following elements, as well as any additional information specific to the entity being proposed:
   a) A description of the purpose and mission of the proposed entity;
   b) A description of whether and how the proposed entity addresses the teaching, research, and service missions of the University of Maryland;
   c) A description of whether and how the proposed entity intends to incorporate graduate students and undergraduate students;
   d) An explanation of how the proposed entity differs from existing Centers or Institutes at the University that focus on similar or related topics;
   e) An overview of expected interdisciplinary connections and collaborations, if appropriate;
f) Details regarding the proposed administrative and organizational structure, as well as any planned advisory or governance structures;

g) A description of space requirements needed for the entity, including any specialized equipment or space needs;

h) An overview of the financial model of the proposed entity;

i) Benchmarks and metrics to be used in measuring the proposed entity’s progress and success; and

j) A research and/or budget plan for the first five years of operations.

C. Review Process for Proposals

1. All proposals should be submitted to the proposed Unit Head, who will oversee the review of the proposal.

2. Review of Proposals for DLCs

   a) The Unit Head will review the proposal, and should submit it to the departmental Programs, Curricula, and Courses (PCC) Committee for review.

   b) The Unit Head will consider the recommendation from the PCC Committee and the merits of the proposal, and will make a recommendation to the Dean.

3. Review of Proposals for CLCs, ILCs, and Institutes

   a) The Unit Head should submit the proposal to the relevant College PCC Committee(s) for review.

   b) In reviewing the proposal, the Unit Head should consider the merits of the proposal and the feasibility of the request(s) for space and funding necessary to create and maintain the Center.

      (1) Funding sources may include, but are not limited to College funds, short-term commitments from the University, and/or external funds.

      (2) The Unit Head will work in consultation with the Approval Authority on assessing the space and funding aspects of the proposal.

         (a) The Senior Vice President & Provost may request that proposals that capitalize on special funding opportunities where the College cannot supply all necessary resources, or those that involve large or long-term commitments from University funds, be reviewed by the Academic Planning Advisory Committee (APAC).
(b) The Senior Vice President & Provost may ask APAC to review other proposals for CLCs, ILCs, and Institutes, as appropriate.

c) After review of the proposal and consideration of any recommendations from the PCC Committee and APAC, the Unit Head will make a recommendation to the appropriate Approval Authority.

D. Approval Process for Center & Institute Proposals

1. The Approval Authority will determine whether to approve the establishment of the proposed Center or Institute. The Approval Authority for entities at different levels of organization are specified in section IV above.

2. Proposals to establish Institutes will be reported to the University System of Maryland.
   a) The Chancellor will be notified of the establishment of all Institutes.
   b) The establishment of a Multi-Institutional Center or Institute will require the approvals of the Presidents of each institution and the Chancellor.
   c) The establishment of a Center or Institute that is administratively separate from the University of Maryland will require the approval of the President, the Chancellor, and the Board of Regents.

3. Approved proposals for new Centers and Institutes should be forwarded to the Division of Research for inclusion of the new entity in public-facing information about Centers and Institutes at the University, and for internal tracking of Centers and Institutes by the Division.

VI. Periodic Review Processes

A. Review of Groups

1. Groups need not undergo a formal periodic review process.

B. Review of Centers & Institutes

1. Centers and Institutes must be reviewed every five years.

2. The initial five-year review of a new Center or Institute is a major milestone in assessing its future viability and subsequent reviews will assess continued sustainability.
3. Reviews should be tracked by the Division of Research, which will notify Unit Heads of the need to initiate a review. Unit Heads will be responsible for ensuring that reviews occur on schedule, and will oversee the review process.

a) All reviews should begin with a self-assessment conducted by the Director of the Center or Institute.

b) Reviews for Institutes should include an external review. Reviews for DLCs, CLCs, and ILCs may include an external review if recommended by the Unit Head in consultation with the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Research if the Center is engaged in research activities.

c) Reviews should measure progress against the benchmarks and metrics for success identified during the establishment of the entity and/or in the immediate past review. Reviews should also include consideration of the following elements:

(1) Continued alignment with the mission and purpose of the University and the Unit(s) affiliated with the entity;

(2) An assessment of activities and trend data since the establishment of the entity or since the last review;

(3) An evaluation of challenges and opportunities since the last review;

(4) An assessment of financial viability;

(5) An assessment of the efficacy of organizational and administrative structures;

(6) Quality of any related instruction, advising, mentorship, or professional development activities;

(7) Research activities including peer-reviewed publications, scholarship, and creative activities performed by the Center or Institute since the last review;

(8) Service and outreach activities;

(9) Stakeholder feedback;

(10) A reevaluation of the benchmarks and metrics for success; and

(11) An assessment of whether changes are needed to enable future success.

d) Components of external funding agency reviews may be used to fulfill elements of a periodic review, when authorized by the Unit Head.

4. The results of the review(s) should be sent to the Unit Head for consideration.
5. The Unit Head will make a recommendation to the Approval Authority.

6. The Approval Authority will make a final determination on actions following a review as defined in Section VII.

7. Upon completion of all review processes, notification should be forwarded to the Division of Research so that public-facing information and internal tracking mechanisms for Centers and Institutes can be updated by the Division.

C. Review of Center & Institute Directors

1. Directors must undergo a formal comprehensive review. The review should normally occur concurrent with the periodic review of the Center or Institute unless an alternative timeline is authorized by the Unit Head.

2. The major components of the review should consider:
   a) How well the Director is fulfilling his/her administrative responsibilities based on those articulated at the time of appointment;
   b) How the Director’s leadership has impacted the Center or Institute’s progress in meeting its benchmarks and metrics for success;
   c) Input from faculty, staff, and students associated with the Center or Institute;
   d) Input from external stakeholders, as appropriate; and
   e) Constructive recommendations for continued success.

3. Components of external funding agency reviews of Directors may be used to fulfill elements of this review, when authorized by the Unit Head.

4. The Unit Head will appoint a representative internal review committee, which will be responsible for conducting the review and submitting its findings in a written report.

5. The Unit Head will consider the review committee’s report and the Director’s response to the report before making a recommendation regarding continuation of the appointment to the Approval Authority, who will make a final determination.

VII. Outcomes Following Periodic Reviews of Centers & Institutes

A. The Center or Institute may be approved to continue normal operations with no modifications.

B. Reorganization or renaming procedures may be initiated.
1. If the Approval Authority determines that a reorganization is warranted following a review, the Unit Head may initiate procedures to transition the Center or Institute to a different type of entity.

   a) The Unit Head may recommend reorganizing existing Centers by combining two or more Centers, creating umbrella structures, splitting one Center into two or more Centers, changing the level at which the entity operates, or may consider other structural changes appropriate to the needs identified in the review.

   b) The Unit Head should consult with the faculty and administrators engaged in the entity’s work, as well as with the relevant College(s), the Dean(s), the Senior Vice President and Provost, and/or the Vice President for Research prior to approving a reorganization.

   c) If the proposed reorganization would result in the creation of a new Center, the new Center should be approved through the process for establishing a Center outlined in Section V.B.

2. If the review indicates that the name of the entity should be changed, the Unit Head may initiate a process to rename the entity.

   a) The Unit Head should consult with faculty and administrators engaged in the work of the entity to develop a new name, and may consider engaging departmental or College-level committees as appropriate.

   b) The Unit Head should determine whether a proposed new name would conflict with names used by existing Centers or Institutes at the University that focus on similar or related topics, and whether the proposed name is appropriate for the level at which the entity operates.

   c) The Unit Head may approve a new name for the entity after consultation with key stakeholders and the Approval Authority.

   d) The Unit Head must notify the Division of Research of a name change so that public-facing information and internal tracking mechanisms for Centers and Institutes can be updated by the Division.

C. In the event of a negative review, the Center or Institute may be placed on probation.

   1. The Unit Head, in consultation with the Director, will develop a plan of corrective actions that must be taken during the probationary period to address the factors that led to the negative review.
2. The Center or Institute will have up to two years from the point at which the plan is finalized to implement the corrective actions.

3. The Center or Institute will submit a self-assessment to the Unit Head detailing its progress in addressing the factors that led to the negative review within two years.

4. The Unit Head will review the self-assessment and make a recommendation to the Approval Authority.

5. The Approval Authority will make a final determination on actions following the implementation of the plan. The Approval Authority may:
   a) Remove probationary status and approve the continuation of normal operations;
   b) Determine whether additional corrective actions are needed;
   c) Determine whether additional time to address specific issues would be appropriate; or
   d) Initiate sunsetting procedures.

D. Sunsetting procedures may be initiated by the Approval Authority.

1. The Unit Head will develop the sunsetting plan, in consultation with the Approval Authority, as appropriate. The Unit Head may engage the Director in the development of the sunsetting plan.

2. The sunsetting plan should address, among other things:
   a) The timeframe of the phase-out period, which may range from a few months to up to two years;
   b) the reassignment or expiration of faculty/staff appointments;
   c) plans for ensuring the continued support of graduate students whose research is associated with the entity; and
   d) how to address remaining grants and other financial matters.

3. The Unit Head will be responsible for taking any necessary steps to remove a Group, Center, or Institute from any public-facing websites or materials following sunsetting.

4. Upon completion of sunsetting processes for Centers and Institutes, notification should be forwarded to the Division of Research for removal of the entity from
public-facing information about Centers and Institutes at the University, and from internal tracking of Centers and Institutes by the Division.

E. The Approval Authority may initiate termination procedures as specified in Section VIII.

VIII. Termination

A. Groups, Centers, and Institutes may be terminated at any time due to inactivity, lack of funding, or lack of interest by the faculty.

1. Groups may be terminated by the Unit Head if the faculty within the Group have left the University or are no longer interested in actively pursuing the focus area.

2. Termination may also be initiated by the faculty within the Group, Center, or Institute when faculty support for the entity no longer exists, if there is no interest among the faculty in participating in or leading the entity, or when the entity is no longer financially viable. Requests for termination may be submitted to the Unit Head for consideration.

B. Centers and Institutes may be terminated as a result of the periodic review process.

1. Termination of Centers and Institutes may be initiated by the Unit Head if at the time of review they determine that a Center or Institute is inactive and has no existing faculty or staff dedicated to its work.

2. Centers and Institutes may be terminated as the result of a negative review or following a negative outcome from a probationary period, at the discretion of the Approval Authority.

3. The process of dissolving a Center or Institute must:
   a) take into consideration the contractual obligations and employment agreements with the faculty and staff associated with the entity, and determine how these will be fulfilled; and
   b) ensure the continued support of graduate students whose research is associated with the entity.

IX. Implementation

A. The requirement for regular reviews of Centers and Institutes applies to all such entities established prior to July 2020, as well as to any new entities created under this Policy.
B. Centers and Institutes that have an existing five-year review cycle should transition to the new review processes established in this Policy at the time of their next review.

C. Centers and Institutes that have not been reviewed within the past five years or that do not have a defined review cycle should be reviewed as soon as is practical using the processes outlined in this Policy.
Draft Administrative Recommendations

● The Division of Research should create and maintain a repository of information on centers and institutes. The repository should include an online public-facing list of all centers and institutes, as well as an internal database that can be used to track key details about each center and institute. The database should include information about a center or institute's size, funding sources and levels, administrative structure, last review, upcoming review date. The database will need to be maintained and updated regularly.

● Each Dean should establish a staggered schedule for reviewing existing centers & institutes under the provisions of the revised policy to ease implementation. Schedules should incorporate entities that already have an existing review cycle, but should also establish a review cycle for centers and institutes that have not been reviewed on a periodic basis. All existing centers and institutes should be reviewed under this structure within five years of adoption of the revisions to the policy.

● A standard application form or template should be created to ensure that all proposals for new centers and institutes address key elements outlined in the policy.

● Guidance on establishing and reviewing centers & institutes should be developed to assist Deans and department chairs in conducting review processes that are in alignment with the policy. The Division of Research should provide units with advanced notice of an upcoming review to allow units to prepare for the review process.

● The policy on the review of academic units should be revised to remove the requirement that centers be reviewed with units.

● The University Senate should conduct a review of this policy and its implementation in 2025.

● Unit Heads should consider conducting annual discussions with Center & Institute Directors to broadly assess annual objectives, including the challenges and opportunities that Centers & Institutes face each year and tangible outcomes, where appropriate.