

## **University Senate**

February 9, 2011

### **Members Present**

Members present at the meeting: 105

### **Call to Order**

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

### **Approval of the Minutes**

Chair Mabbs asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the December 8, 2010 meeting. Hearing none, she declared the minutes approved as distributed.

### **Report of the Chair**

#### BOR Staff Awards

Mabbs explained that the Board of Regents (BOR) Staff Awards process was in its final stages. Each year, the Staff Affairs Committee coordinates the internal search for nominations for the Board of Regents Staff Awards. This year, they reviewed 26 exempt staff nominations and 6 non-exempt staff nominations, which was a substantial increase in exempt nominations from previous years. The Staff Affairs Committee recommended seven nominees to be forwarded to President Loh for final selection. President Loh confirmed and endorsed the seven nominees and sent them to Council of University System Staff (CUSS) for the next review stage of the awards process. The CUSS Review Committee will select the final candidates to be submitted to the Board of Regents. Recipients will be announced over the summer. The following nominees were recommended from our campus:

Luke Jensen, LGBT Equity  
Anthony Chan, Psychology  
Alan Santos, Civil & Environmental Engineering  
Cecilia Jordan, Biology  
Carolyn Consoli, Public Safety  
Martha Connolly, Maryland Technology Enterprise Institute (MTECH)  
Jeff McKinney, Electrical & Computer Engineering

#### Nominations Committee

Mabbs stated that the Senate Nominations Committee is currently seeking candidates to run for open positions on Senate-elected committees and councils, including the 2011-2012 Senate Executive Committee, Committee on Committees, the Athletic Council, the Council of University System Faculty, and the Campus Transportation Advisory Committee. If you are a continuing Senator, and you are interested in running for a position, please fill out a form and return it to the Senate Office. The deadline for nominations is February 18, 2011. Nominees will be considered for placement on the slate for election, but are not guaranteed a spot. All

candidates will be asked to submit a short candidacy statement for the elections held at our transition meeting on May 4, 2011.

#### Campus Safety Forum

Mabbs announced that the Campus Affairs Committee is organizing the Campus Safety Forum. They have scheduled it for Tuesday, February 22, 2011 from 6-7:30 p.m. in 0100 Marie Mount Hall (Maryland Room). The major discussion topic will be traffic safety and they will be taking feedback for their review of a campus-wide helmet policy. She strongly encouraged senators to attend the forum.

### **Committee Reports**

#### **Review of the Final Exam Policy (Senate Doc. No. 09-10-07) (Information)**

Mabbs stated that the Educational Affairs Committee submitted its report. The SEC reviewed it at the meeting on January 28, 2011. Per the committee's request, the recommendations have been forwarded to the Provost for further administrative action and have been provided to the Senate as an informational item.

#### **Re-evaluation of the Student Teacher Evaluations at UMD (Senate Doc. No. 10-11-06) (Information)**

Mabbs stated that the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee submitted its report. The SEC reviewed it at the meeting on January 28, 2011. Per the committee's request, the recommendations have been forwarded to the Provost for further review and have been provided to the Senate as an informational item.

#### **PCC Proposal to Revise the Title of the Bachelor of Arts in Italian Language and Literature to the Bachelor of Arts in Italian Studies (Senate Doc. No. 10-11-35) (Action)**

David Salness, Chair of the Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the proposal to the Senate and provided background information.

Mabbs opened the floor to discussion; hearing none, she called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 71 in favor, 2 opposed, and 4 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

#### **Review of Quorum Calculation in Senate Standing Committees (Senate Doc. No. 09-10-41) (Action)**

Marc Pound, Chair of the Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee, presented the proposal to assign a specific quorum to larger Senate committees to the Senate and provided background information.

Mabbs opened the floor to discussion; hearing none, she called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 74 in favor, 8 opposed, and 6 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

**Proposal to Increase Access to Public Records (Senate Doc. No. 09-10-47)  
(Action)**

Gene Ferrick, Chair of the Campus Affairs Committee, presented the proposal to allow electronic requests for public information to the Senate and provided background information.

Mabbs opened the floor to discussion.

Senator Kahn, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Natural Sciences, stated that he was uncomfortable with allowing email requests for information that is not freely available. Making people do surface mail requests, ups the anti, by requiring a signature and an address. He suggested that we should stick to the old way to make requestors go through the effort.

Ferrick responded that the Legal Office posed the same argument. The committee did not want to dictate an online form. Instead, they suggested that the Legal Office create a dedicated email for requests and post more information on what can and cannot be requested. The committee did not want to outline specifics on how this should be implemented

Senator Kronrod, Graduate Student, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that it seems old fashioned to send postal mail. If abuse occurs, it can be addressed individually. Electronic requests are good for the environment, save paper, money on postage, and are better for record keeping. He supports the proposal because it is intended for public records not secret data.

Dean Hamilton, Voting Ex-Officio, introduced Leon Slaughter who inquired whether there would be a minimum requirement for contact information in the email request.

Ferrick responded that there is prescribed information as a requirement included in the proposal.

Senator Stamm, Graduate Student, College of Engineering, explained that in the committee's recommendations, points D & E that specify that the custodian can seek clarification. This inquiry could serve as a firewall for those spamming.

Mabbs called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 73 in favor, 21 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

**Proposal to Review Retirement Program Selection Process (Senate Doc. No. 10-11-10) (Action)**

Robert Schwab, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee and Cynthia Shaw, Chair of the Staff Affairs Committee, presented the proposal to the Senate and provided background information.

Mabbs opened the floor to discussion; hearing none, she called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 83 in favor, 2 opposed, and 9 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

**Report of the General Education Implementation Committee: The General Education Implementation Plan (Senate Doc. No. 10-11-31)**

Mabbs explained that the next item on the agenda is the final version of the General Education Implementation Plan. She stated that this plan provides for the implementation of the General Education Plan approved by the Senate in April 2010. Dean Hamilton had already given an overview of the Implementation Committee's work at our October 13, 2010 Senate Meeting and presented a draft report at the December 8, 2010 Senate Meeting. The Implementation Committee has since revised and finalized the General Education Implementation Plan for final approval of the Senate today.

Donna Hamilton, Chair of the General Education Implementation Committee, gave a brief overview of the changes that the committee had made to the Draft Plan.

Procedural Motion

Mabbs explained that included a Procedural Motion from the Senate Executive Committee was included in the Senate materials. Before starting discussion of the implementation plan, we will discuss and vote on the procedural motion. This motion is outlined as follows:

1. Amendments must be moved and seconded by a Senator on the floor of the Senate.
2. Amendments that were submitted by the deadline will be discussed first in each category. [No amendments were submitted prior to the meeting]
3. Amendments will be discussed in the order of the following five categories:
  - a. General Education Learning Outcomes
  - b. Faculty Boards
  - c. Guidelines and Requirements for the Course Categories
  - d. CORE and the New General Education Program
  - e. Other
4. Each presenter will be given 2 minutes to discuss the amendment after presenting it.
5. Each additional speaker will have 2 minutes for discussion of that amendment.

6. A speaker may only speak a second time once everyone else has had an opportunity to speak.

7. Total discussion of each amendment will be limited to 20 minutes.

Mabbs opened the floor to discussion of the procedural motion; hearing none, she called for a vote on the motion. The result was 83 in favor, 7 opposed, and 4 abstentions. **The procedural motion passed.**

#### Discussion & Vote of the General Education Implementation Plan

Mabbs clarified that the members of the General Education Implementation Committee could speak or respond to any amendments without introduction by a senator. However, they must go to the microphones like all other senators in order to speak. She asked all speakers to state their name, constituency, and college when they approach the microphone.

Because there were no previously submitted amendments, Mabbs stated that we would take amendments from the floor in each category.

#### General Education Learning Outcomes

Mabbs opened the floor to amendments and discussion of the *General Education Learning Outcomes* section.

Senator Gulick, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Natural Sciences, inquired whether implementation of the fundamental studies and analytical reasoning sections would require increased resources so that the Math Department could meet the increased demands.

Elizabeth Beise, Member of the General Education Implementation Committee, stated that they have done an analysis of seat requirements with the Math Department and the Institutional Research Planning & Assessment (IRPA) Office. They estimate a 3 percent increase in seats required for both areas. We still do not know which courses will be in the analytic reasoning section.

Senator Gullickson, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, voiced serious concern about writing learning outcomes for courses that are being submitted to the General Education program. History has submitted 42 courses that took the faculty a minimum of four hours for each course. This totals to five weeks of one person's time that could have been better spent on research, teaching etc. She stated that the History faculty were not consulted about the questions used to design the learning outcomes. She feels that the faculty had little input in this process.

Donna Hamilton, Chair of the General Education Implementation Committee, stated that when a call was put out for membership of the learning outcomes

committee, we were unable to get anyone from History to join the committee. Those on the committee were sensitive to the fact that there were no historians on the committee. The draft was sent to David Freund in History and Ira Berlin for comment.

Senator Gullickson, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that her concern is not just about the History Department but about the total faculty time being used across the university and especially in humanities. It is not a profitable exercise and uses our time in an inappropriate way. She also commented that some of her colleagues do not even know what learning outcomes are.

Senator Leone, Faculty, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, stated that this allows faculty to find new ways to teach. The point of the Senate passing this plan is to engage all of us who teach in the process of understanding how to teach slightly differently. He urged the Senate to pass this as a way of engaging ourselves in finishing a process that started two years ago and as a way of improving our relationship with the undergraduates. There is feedback, depending on your college, between the Chair and the faculty. He urged the Senate to take Gullickson's comments seriously and incorporate them into a positive vote.

Madlen Simon, Member of the General Education Implementation Committee, stated that we are re-examining the concept of a liberal education and how we provide this to our students. It is a large and worthy cause. While it is tremendously time consuming, the plan purposefully engages faculty throughout the campus. It is a conversation for us to have at the campus level that is important to the core of what we are doing here. She is in support of the concept that this is hard work but it is a worthy goal for faculty.

#### Faculty Boards

Mabbs opened the floor to amendments and discussion of the *Faculty Boards* section.

Senator Newhagen, Faculty, College of Journalism, inquired about the mechanism used to select the members of the faculty boards.

Dean Hamilton, Voting Ex-Officio, Chair of the General Education Implementation Committee, stated that the Dean for Undergraduate Studies and the collegiate deans select the members of the Faculty Boards. The deans forward suggestions to the Dean for Undergraduate Studies who in turn must pass the membership by the Senate's General Education Committee. These steps allow for accountability.

#### Guidelines and Requirements for the Course Categories

Mabbs opened the floor to amendments and discussion of the *Guidelines and Requirements for the Course Categories* section.

Senator Petkas, Exempt Staff, stated that when he raised questions about the cultural competence section, he intended to call attention to the types of learning that are important to our graduates to become constructive citizens and leaders in a diverse society. He thanked Hamilton for her willingness to entertain the changes to the paragraph in the cultural competence section. However, the heading "Cultural Competence" should be reconsidered in the future because it implies a static achievement instead of an ongoing learning process.

#### CORE and the New General Education Program

Mabbs opened the floor to amendments and discussion of the *CORE and the New General Education Program* section.

There was no discussion or amendments on this section.

#### Other

Mabbs opened the floor to amendments and discussion of any other areas of the plan not previously discussed.

Senator Gulick, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Natural Sciences, asked whether there has been a cost analysis for what will be needed for the whole new general education program.

Elizabeth Beise, Member of the General Education Implementation Committee, responded that a cost analysis is in progress. We have a good idea of seats required for fundamental studies but we are still in the process of collecting the costs and needs including instruction and classrooms. We know that academic and professional writing will require a 15% increase in seats and mathematics and analytic reasoning will require a 3% increase. Oral communication will require more seats because it is a new category. There will be more flexibility in the distributive studies category because there are fewer course categories and one fewer course. We do not know the impact of experiential learning opportunities, and we do not know where all of the scholarship in practice courses will come from. We still need more information on student enrollment patterns. We will do some more analysis as courses roll in and will re-evaluate on an annual basis.

Senator Miletich, Undergraduate, College of Arts & Humanities, thanked the committee for adjusting the description of the humanities to include the performing arts.

Senator Smith, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, suggested that the term "cultural competence" be reconsidered when the plan is reviewed in the future.

Mabbs called for a vote of the General Education Implementation Plan. The result was 71 in favor, 8 opposed, and 5 abstentions. **The motion to approve the plan passed.**

### **New Business**

Senator Gulick, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Natural Sciences stated that the student evaluation topic is crying out for comment. He was surprised that there was no opportunity for faculty to give input on the process. He had serious concerns about the lack of civility in the evaluations.

Mabbs explained that the APAS Committee's recommendations were forwarded to the Provost's Office for administrative action. She also encouraged those with comments on the issue to contact the Provost's Office.

Senator Goodman, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Natural Sciences, made a motion that the Senate thank Nariman Farvardin for his extraordinary service as Provost. Adopted by acclamation.

Chair Mabbs expressed the Senate's gratitude to Provost Farvardin and wished him success in his future endeavors.

### **Adjournment**

Senate Chair Mabbs adjourned the meeting at 4:12 p.m.