

University Senate

February 5, 2014

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 102

Call to Order

Senate Chair Novara called the meeting to order at 3:21 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

Chair Novara asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the November 13, 2013 meeting. Hearing none he declared the minutes approved as distributed.

Report of the Chair

Senate Elections

Chair Novara reported that the Senate Office had initiated the candidacy/election process for all staff, student, and single-member constituency senators for 2014-2015 on January 22, 2014. The candidacy deadline is Friday, February 7, 2014, and elections will run from February 24, 2014 through March 7, 2014. He encouraged those in attendance to run to be a senator, or to encourage colleagues to do the same. Details about the timeline and process are available under the "Elections" tab on the Senate website (senate.umd.edu).

Senate Elected Committees/Councils

Chair Novara stated that all senators should have received an email from the Senate Office yesterday detailing available positions on senate-elected committees/councils for 2014-2015. This includes the Senate Executive Committee, Committee on Committees, Athletic Council, Council of University System Faculty (CUSF), and the Campus Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC). We are looking for individuals interested in serving on these important bodies. Please visit the Senate website for information on how to nominate yourself or a colleague.

Spring Senate Meetings

Chair Novara stated that we are anticipating a significant amount of work coming out of our committees during the remaining meetings of the semester. Please note that the April 17, 2014, meeting will be the last for outgoing senators. May 7, 2014, is the transition meeting when new senators will be seated.

**Alignment of Procurement Contracts with UM Non-Discrimination Values
(Senate Doc. No. 12-13-29) (Information)**

Chair Novara stated that the Alignment of Procurement Contracts with UM Non-Discrimination Values report from the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Committee had been provided to the Senate as an informational report. After a thorough review, the EDI Committee does not recommend any changes to the Procurement Policies and Procedures, given the fact that the Department of Procurement and Supply has voluntarily adopted the State Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) regulations, and non-discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity is covered by a separate University System of Maryland (USM) policy. The committee endorses current practices that the Department of Procurement and Supply has in place in order to comply with University and State non-discrimination policies and regulations.

**Review of the Evidentiary Standards in the Code of Student Conduct
(Senate Doc. No. 12-13-30) (Information)**

Chair Novara stated that the Review of the Evidentiary Standards in the Code of Student Conduct report from the Student Conduct Committee had also been provided to the Senate as an information item. After a thorough review, the Student Conduct Committee has recommended that no changes are necessary at this time because there is no evidence that having two different standards of evidence in the Code of Student Conduct is having a negative impact on the review and processing procedures for non-academic misconduct cases. However, the committee acknowledges that it may be pertinent to revisit the issue in one or two years.

**Nominations Committee Slate 2013-2014 (Senate Doc. No. 13-14-10)
(Information)**

Chair Novara explained that the Nominations Committee Slate 2013-2014 was originally an action item on the December senate meeting agenda. Because the University was closed due to inclement weather on December 10, 2013, and the Senate was unable to meet, the SEC voted on behalf of the Senate to approve the slate. The Nominations Committee typically begins its work in January, so delaying the vote until the February senate meeting would have significantly postponed its work. Novara stated that the Senate does have the authority to require a vote on the slate. Section 4.3 of the Senate Bylaws states that 10 senators may require a vote of the Senate. He opened the floor to any objections to the approved slate; hearing none, he stated that the SEC approval of the Nominations Committee Slate would stand.

PCC Proposal to Establish a New Upper-Division Certificate in Leadership Studies (Senate Doc. No. 13-14-12) (Action)

Marilee Lindemann, Chair of the Programs Curricula and Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the PCC Proposal to Establish a New Upper-Division Certificate in Leadership Studies and provided background information.

Novara opened the floor to discussion of the proposal; hearing none, he called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 76 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to Establish a Bachelor's Program in Early Childhood Education and Early Childhood Special Education (Senate Doc. No. 13-14-19) (Action)

Marilee Lindemann, Chair of the Programs Curricula and Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the PCC Proposal to Establish a Bachelor's Program in Early Childhood Education and Early Childhood Special Education and provided background information.

Novara opened the floor to discussion of the proposal.

Senator Moyes, Faculty, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, inquired about what would be cut from merging separate four and five year programs. How will it affect the students' ability to pass certification?

Joan Lieber, Professor, Counseling, Higher Education, and Special Education, responded that the undergraduate program in Special Education was originally a five-year program that resulted in a bachelor's degree plus a master's degree in special education. This program will not result in a master's degree. Students who are certified in special education did get certification in severe disabilities as well. The new program will not include that certification just early childhood and early childhood generic special education. If students wish, they may return and obtain a master's degree in severe disability certification. This can be done at a future time, but it does not prevent them from getting certification in either area.

Senator Moyes inquired how important the severe disability certification is to our students.

Lieber responded that most students who are served in special education programs do not have severe disabilities, but rather mild or moderate disabilities, speech and language delays, and some motor delays.

Hearing no further discussion, Novara called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 83 in favor, 5 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposals from the Robert H. Smith School of Business

Novara called on Marilee Lindemann, Chair of the Programs Curricula and Courses (PCC) Committee, to present the next four agenda items, which were related PCC proposals from the Robert H. Smith School of Business. He explained that each proposal would be discussed and voted on separately following the overall presentation.

Lindemann presented the PCC Proposal to Establish a Master of Science in Accounting (Senate Doc. No. 13-14-21), the PCC Proposal to Establish a Master of Science in Information Systems (Senate Doc. No. 13-14-22), the PCC Proposal to Establish a Master of Science in Marketing Analytics (Senate Doc. No. 13-14-23), and the PCC Proposal to Establish a Master of Science in Supply Chain Management (Senate Doc. No. 13-14-24) and provided background information. She noted that the Robert H. Smith School of Business wishes to create stand-alone Masters of Science degree programs based on the current concentrations within its Master of Science in Business Program. The lack of formal degree programs in each area has been a detriment to graduates in the School, since the formal program name listed on the diploma does not accurately reflect the expertise of the graduates or demands of the market.

PCC Proposal to Establish a Master of Science in Accounting (Senate Doc. No. 13-14-21) (Action)

Novara opened the floor to discussion of the PCC Proposal to Establish a Master of Science in Accounting.

Senator Wu, Graduate Student, Robert H. Smith School of Business, asked for the Senate's support of the proposal because of the high demand in the domestic and international markets for these programs. Having separate programs will give us a competitive edge in recruiting students.

Hearing no further discussion, Novara called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 86 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to Establish a Master of Science in Information Systems (Senate Doc. No. 13-14-22) (Action)

Novara opened the floor to discussion of the PCC Proposal to Establish a Master in Information Systems.

Senator Sussman, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences (CMNS), stated that there was no mention of how this program would overlap with existing programs in the College of Information Studies (INFO) and the Department of Computer Science.

Betsy Beise, Member of the PCC Committee, stated that there have been discussions between the College of Information Studies (INFO) and those overseeing this program about an undergraduate program. There is collaboration but not much overlap. She was not as familiar with the relationship between this program and the computer science program. This is an existing curriculum that has been in place for a number of years.

Senator McKinney, Full-Time Instructor, stated that this is a pre-existing program. The only thing changing is the name on the degree. The program and administration will stay the same. This is merely for marketing to attract students.

Senator Ayyagari, Undergraduate Student, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, inquired whether there were other benefits to the separate programs, aside from clarity.

McKinney stated that separating the programs gives the School flexibility with regard to pricing differentials. There are things that facilitate and promote the program better by being stand-alone such as the administrative aspect. There are advantages in marketing, pricing, and attracting students.

Beise responded that the advantage of disaggregating the programs is that students who want to pursue two different degrees can do that. There are also efforts underway to do five-year programs with the finance program. There is an added flexibility for dual programs and pricing.

Senator St. Jean, Faculty, College of Information Studies (INFO), stated that INFO offers a degree in information management and inquired about the difference between that program and this one.

McKinney stated that the information systems program has been around for at least 30-40 years. He was not sure what distinguishes it from the information management program.

Charles Caramello, Dean of the Graduate School, stated that the proposal had gone through Graduate PCC and the Graduate School, who typically vet these by looking at overlaps and conflicts with other programs, and this particular proposal went through without any problems.

Senator Cox, Graduate Student, Robert H. Smith School of Business, inquired whether this proposal would affect the part-time business programs. She asked

whether it would only apply to the full-time program or also the part-time. She also asked about the effect on students applying to MBA programs with a concentration.

McKinney stated that this would be applied retrospectively to degrees both full and part-time. There is a difference between MBA programs with a concentration and the MS degree. This would not affect MBA programs.

Senator Alt, Faculty, Robert H. Smith School of Business, stated that when you apply to the School of Business, you apply to either the MBA program or the MS program. If a student were looking for a specialization in a concentration, you would apply for the MS. The MBA program is an overarching program where you would get training in marketing, information systems, accounting etc. It is not designed along the same path as the MS program. People who pursue the MS might want to be the Director of Marketing for an organization, whereas with an MBA, you would be capable of filling a number of positions in an organization.

Senator Wu, Graduate Student, Robert H. Smith School of Business, stated that he supports the program. He believes that separate programs are not needed in the MBA program. Separate MS programs will help the University recruit more elite international students, help with graduate job placement, and create a stronger alumni network.

Hearing no further discussion, Novara called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 73 in favor, 10 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

**PCC Proposal to Establish a Master of Science in Marketing Analytics
(Senate Doc. No. 13-14-23) (Action)**

Novara opened the floor to discussion of the PCC Proposal to Establish a Master in Marketing Analytics; hearing none, he called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 84 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

**PCC Proposal to Establish a Master of Science in Supply Chain
Management (Senate Doc. No. 13-14-24) (Action)**

Novara opened the floor to discussion of the PCC Proposal to Establish a Master in Supply Chain Management; hearing none, he called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 81 in favor, 3 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Special Order of the Day
Bradley Hatfield
Chair, Joint Provost/Senate APT Guidelines Task Force
Progress Report and Guiding Principles

Chair Novara welcomed Bradley Hatfield, Chair of the Joint Provost/Senate APT Guidelines Task Force, to present a progress report on the task force's work thus far.

Hatfield thanked the Senate for the opportunity and noted the other members of the taskforce. He gave a brief overview of the task force's overarching goal, modus operandi, and guiding perspectives throughout the course of its review.

Overarching Goal

In order to contribute to excellence in our faculty and institution, the overarching goal of the task force is to provide recommendations for incorporation in the *University of Maryland Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure* that promote accuracy, integrity, and clarity of the candidate's record of achievement in scholarly, creative, instructional, mentoring, and service activities through a fair, just, and transparent decision-making process. The committee also recognizes the need to consider the full range of scholarship of our diverse faculty.

Modus Operandi

1. Identified current language in the *University of Maryland Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure* document relevant to the element under consideration,
2. Formulated **principles** to guide the construction of language that would reflect the overarching goal,
3. Identified relevant best practices from peer institutions,
4. And constructed new language for incorporation in the *Guidelines* document and, if needed, revised policy language.

Guiding Perspectives

- Balancing of interests (e.g., the candidate and the University; impartiality vs. insight as a collaborator)
- Deference to the local level - first level of review
- Specificity – one size does not fit all
- Recognition of synergies (i.e., APT and campus initiatives such as mentoring of faculty)
- Education of unit leaders

Hatfield noted that the task force focused on ten major areas of the charge: candidate notification; equity, fairness, and inclusion; external evaluations/letter solicitation; innovation and entrepreneurship; interdisciplinary research; mentoring; star appointments; standard format; teaching; and work-life balance.

These areas were carefully considered and guiding principles and potential actions have been developed as follows:

External Evaluators/Letter Solicitation

Principle: Research fields have become increasingly collaborative across a wide spectrum, resulting in many connections between researchers in some fields (e.g., through large-scale collaborations involving hundreds of people, edited volumes, etc.). There should, therefore, be flexibility in the guidelines regarding selection of external evaluators, which would allow for the possibility, in such cases, of seeking evaluations from those who would normally be deemed collaborators.

The process of letter solicitation needs standardization, clarity, and objective consideration of refusals and non-responses.

Actions:

- Letters from collaborators may be included (e.g., large collaborations) but must be justified.
- Evaluators should be leaders in the field regardless of institutional affiliation.
- Initial email contact to establish evaluator's availability. Letter log will include availability requests.
- Reference request should ask for an evaluation based on criteria provided from UM.

Teaching

Principle: The goal is to provide diverse forms of evidence to characterize the candidate's teaching and mentoring.

Actions:

- Systematic peer reviews of teaching must be conducted and included in the dossier.
- The candidate may submit a teaching portfolio that could include items such as course syllabi, reflective assessments, mentoring accomplishments.

Candidate Notification

Principle: To foster transparency of the promotion and tenure process within the constraints of requisite confidentiality.

Actions:

- Candidates may indicate if there are specific individuals in the field who might not be expected to give objective reviews.
- Candidate must be shown and certify (sign/date) the reputation of outlets, student evaluations, record of mentoring/advising/research supervision two weeks prior to departmental deliberation.
- Candidate will be informed of decisions (regardless of outcome) within two weeks of the decision by the Chair and decision by the Dean.

Scholarship

Principle: The goal is to recognize and evaluate the full range of scholarship in which a faculty member might engage and to ensure appropriate criteria are in place to measure all scholarship (including new and emerging forms).

Action: Defining scholarship as the discovery, integration, engagement, and transmission of knowledge. The quality of scholarship is assessed through peer review, impact, and significance. The onus is on the candidate to present documentation that their work meets these criteria. Such documentation will include traditional means (e.g. citations, journal impact factors) but may also take other forms.

Innovation and Entrepreneurship

Principle: Full recognition in the tenure process should be given to the broad range of entrepreneurial, public engagement, and creative activities in which faculty engage. These activities may enhance any of the criteria on which faculty are evaluated—teaching, service, and research, scholarship, and artistic creativity. These activities should be rigorously evaluated for high quality and distinction.

Action: Entrepreneurial activities should be included in the candidate's CV and personal statement.

Interdisciplinary Research

Principle: Scholarly activity is dynamic. The promotion and tenure process for Assistant and Associate Professors engaged in interdisciplinary research, an important component of scholarly activity, requires formal recognition by units of the special circumstances (similar to Memoranda-of-Understanding [MOU] for joint appointments) under which they work. Consideration of the unique approach to scholarship and career trajectories is critical at the time of appointment and at the time of examination of the record for promotion and tenure.

Actions:

- Faculty can self-identify as being interdisciplinary if engaged in scholarship in multiple fields or that crosses boundaries of traditional disciplines.
- Formal designation requires mutual agreement between the faculty member and the Chair with an associated MOU outlining expectations and the evaluative process.
- APT reviews of interdisciplinary cases should include a faculty member knowledgeable in the other discipline to serve in an advisory capacity to the subcommittee and the Department APT committee.

Work-Life Balance

Principle: Promotion and tenure policies will acknowledge that candidate dossiers can differ based on life circumstances and the allowances of work-life policies. Such recognition will decrease the probability that faculty who avail themselves of these policies are discriminated against in the promotion and tenure system (implicitly or explicitly).

Actions:

- Promotion and tenure committee members shall be informed when a candidate took parental leave, stopped the tenure clock, or was on a part-time tenure clock and informed that these are university-supported policies.
- Tenure delay text will be included in reference letter requests stating that the faculty member shall not be disadvantaged because of the delay.

Standard Format

Principle: The goal is to develop a standard format for APT dossiers that will make the evaluation of cases more **efficient** and will facilitate a full and fair review of each candidate.

Actions:

- Re-ordering of the dossier to reduce duplication.
- Place primary emphasis on the candidate's record and first-level review materials.
- Includes independent evaluations at each level and should avoid unnecessary repetition in prior reports.
- Administrative information (sample letters, notifications) is placed at the end of the dossier.

Equity, Fairness, and Inclusion

Principle: Providing a fair, equitable, inclusive, and just faculty environment is crucial for maintaining excellence at the University and is essential to the APT process. Achieving equity and justice in the APT process requires complementary institutional changes aimed at reducing unfair hiring, promotion, and retention that results from implicit or explicit biases related solely to decisions based on categories such as gender, race, ethnicity, religion, disability, nationality, sexuality, and similar group membership categories.

Actions:

- Proactive procedure: Annual letter from the University Administration reminding those involved in the review process the importance of conducting a fair and unbiased evaluation.
- APT Chairs at all levels and unit heads (if present) are tasked with ensuring that discussion and evaluation of candidates is impartial, fair, and unbiased.
- Procedures for reporting perceptions of inappropriate discussions during the review process.

Star Appointments

Principle: Hiring of the highest quality faculty is critical to the mission of the University of Maryland. In this regard, attracting "star" professors can have a strong, positive impact. Inflexibility in the APT process and the length of time required to get dossiers approved in the current system can work against the hiring of "star" professors. Accordingly, processes with regard to these hires should be rigorous, but reasonable.

- Actions: Streamlined process for "star" appointments.

- Nominated for this type of evaluation by both the Chair and the Dean and approved by the Provost's Office.
- The 3 evaluative letters suggested by the candidate as well as the CV could be transferred from the search process.
- Process would go through normal first-level review followed by an expedited upper-level review.

Mentoring

Principle: Systematic guidance of Assistant and Associate Professors, achieved through a continuous, diversified (i.e., multiple mentors relative to differing elements of academic activity such as scholarship and mentoring), formalized, and documented procedure in the unit, is an essential element of the APT process to promote excellence in the faculty.

Actions:

- Faculty members will be assigned at least one mentor but are encouraged to seek out multiple mentors.
- Each unit must develop a mentoring plan that will be filed with the Office Faculty Affairs.
- Annual formal mentorship meetings should be held until the tenure review is complete.
- Mentoring should be continue even after the granting of tenure.

Operational Recommendations

- Annual Letter from the Administration
- Administrator Training
- Formal periodic review of the APT Guidelines

Novara opened the floor to questions.

Senator Beckett, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences (CMNS), stated that one of the issues that has come up is related to collaboration and to whom and to what extent to give credit for collaboration. Is collaboration detrimental to the future of a faculty member? There are mixed messages because you are encouraged to do interdisciplinary research that leads to collaboration but then could be penalized for collaboration in the review process. We need to have clear guidelines about assigning credit in a collaborative project.

Hatfield responded that he appreciated the comment and that the task force would consider collaboration as a distinct element from interdisciplinary research. He also noted that the task force has not finalized its recommendations and will incorporate these comments into its work.

Senator Klank, Faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, stated that as a faculty member proceeds into interdisciplinary areas, he/she comes upon things which

are unique and unknown to other colleagues, especially the interrelationship between interdisciplinary structure and collaborative relationships to one another. Often it is not approached at all and thought of as separating you from the time-honored activities. It becomes difficult to get external letters when the things that you do are unique because evaluators may not even be aware of such things.

Hatfield responded that this has been a critical element of the task force's deliberations. We have incorporated a formal recognition of the approach to scholarship and a consultant to give guidance on a reasonable approach for evaluating the candidate.

Ellin Scholnick, Member of the APT Guidelines Task Force, stated that collaboration and interdisciplinary research are two interrelated entities. One cannot occur without the other. We need to address how an individual can establish and express his/her contribution. We need to change the guidelines to incorporate how individuals that do this type of work should be evaluated.

Klank stated that as contributions become more unique, an administrator might not be familiar with how to handle or recognize them. Sometimes indifference can be more difficult to bear than criticism.

Hatfield stated that the task force is trying to craft language to respond to this issue.

Hatfield stated that the task force is working on crafting language to address that issue.

Klank also inquired about giving faculty credit for working with students who have special educational needs.

Laura Rosenthal, Member of the APT Guidelines Task Force, stated that problems like that are why we want to move to a portfolio model of teaching. You can explain special circumstances like that instead of just using student evaluations.

Chair Novara stated that we needed to move to the next agenda item. However, he directed senators to send any additional comments to Reka Montfort at reka@umd.edu. She will forward them to the task force, and they will respond directly.

Novara thanked Hatfield and the task force for its work.

Special Order of the Day
Kumea Shorter-Gooden
Chief Diversity Officer and Associate Vice President
Revisions to the Search and Selection Guidelines

Chair Novara introduced Kumea Shorter-Gooden, Chief Diversity Officer and Associate Vice President, to present the recently approved changes to the search and selection guidelines. President Loh asked the Equity Council to review the current guidelines. The Council took into account current social, technological, and workforce realities by creating a more flexible process while upholding the university's commitment to equity and diversity. The overall goal was to make revisions that result in a diverse and highly qualified workforce. The Council formed a task force that surveyed recent hiring officials, search chairs, and committee members, reviewed practices of peer institutions, and considered "best practices." The task force incorporated feedback from the Equity Council, University Human Resources, Deans, and Vice Presidents prior to President Loh's approval. Shorter-Gooden reviewed the various changes made to the search and selection guidelines.

Core Areas for Changes

- Diversity of Search Committees and Applicant Pools
- Filling Positions in Pay Bands 1 and 2
- Interactions between Hiring Official and Search Committee
- Internet and Social Media
- Search Firms
- Responsibility/Authority Structure

Diversity of Search Committees and Applicant Pools

- The importance of diversity, especially race/ethnicity and gender, in Search Committees, applicant pools, and finalist lists was stressed.
- Finalist lists are expected to be diverse regarding race/ethnicity and gender.

Filling Positions in Pay Bands 1 and 2

- Pay Bands 1 and 2 can be generally filled without the use of a Search Committee.
- Hiring Officials will attend Search and Selection training to learn best practices.
- Hiring Officials are encouraged to include colleagues in the screening and/or interviewing process.
- Equity Administrators review a list of proposed interviewees for diversity.

Interactions between Hiring Official and Search Committee

In consultation w/ Equity Administrator, Hiring Officials **may**:

- Review candidates' applications
- Meet with Search Committees to address questions and get updates

- (In exceptional cases) Interact in a structured manner with semi-finalists to provide info on their vision and respond to candidates' questions

Hiring Officials *may not*:

- Serve as member of Search Committee
- Screen candidates in place of the Search Committee's screening
- Unilaterally add candidates to semi-finalist/finalist lists

Internet and Social Media

- Internet and Social Media may be used to post positions and recruit applicants.
- It should *not* be used as the primary source for information about applicants.
- Information should *not* be used unless related to essential functions of the job AND unless verified.
- Information pertaining to personal characteristics that are not job-related, e.g. race, religious affiliation, and sexual orientation, should *not* be considered.

Use of Search Firms

- The Search Firm must agree to the University's Search and Selection Guidelines and standards of equity, diversity and confidentiality.
- The Search Firm may do applicant recruitment, screening and/or initial interviewing.
- The Search Committee must have access to all applicant materials.
- The Search Committee decides whom they will interview.

Responsibility/Authority Structure

- Each Major Unit Head (President, VP, or Dean) is responsible for their Division/College's adherence to the Search and Selection Guidelines.
- Equity Administrators act on behalf of Major Unit Heads.
- Equity Administrators must be consulted for exceptions to the Guidelines.
- When the Equity Administrator has concerns about implementation of the Guidelines, s/he discusses them with relevant parties, may consult with the University Equity Administrator, and may recommend closing of a search.
- The Major Unit Head has ultimate decision-making authority.

Novara opened the floor to questions; hearing none, he thanked Shorter-Gooden for her presentation.

New Business

There was no new business.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:56 p.m.