University Senate

February 11, 2016

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 90

Call to Order

Senate Chair Brown called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m.

Approval of the December 9, 2015 Senate Minutes (Action)

Chair Brown asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the December 9, 2015 meeting; hearing none, he declared the minutes approved as distributed.

Report of the Chair

Presidential Briefings
Chair Brown reported that President Loh and Provost Rankin were called to testify in Annapolis and President Loh would be unable to provide his briefing.

Senate Leadership Meetings with Senators
Chair Brown reported that he, the Chair-Elect, and Director had been meeting with senator constituency groups this year. He noted that they had already met with the staff and undergraduate student senators and were in the process of arranging meetings with the faculty and graduate student senators. The meetings thus far have included collaborative discussions about ways in which senators can communicate with their constituents, how we can do a better job of communicating with senators, and ideas for what the Senate could do better. We are compiling this feedback to see how best to implement some of the suggestions. He noted that one of the comments from the meeting with the undergraduate senators was that senators need an opportunity to recognize and interact with one another. In an effort to help senators in each constituency recognize each other, he asked each group to stand and encouraged senators to take a moment at each Senate meeting to introduce themselves to the senators sitting around them.

Maryland Dialogues on Diversity and Community
Chair Brown reported that, last week, President Loh and Provost Rankin announced the *Maryland Dialogues on Diversity and Community*. The Maryland Dialogues are a series of events for faculty, staff, students, and alumni to gain a better understanding of these issues and to develop action plans for improvement both locally and nationally. The Office of Diversity and Inclusion also announced a grant program that will provide funding for student groups who initiate programming in support of diversity and inclusion.

He stated that the University Senate encourages all faculty, staff and students to participate in these dialogues and to work towards a campus where we embrace our differences, celebrate diversity, and move forward together. Brown added that, in preparation for these

discussions, it might be helpful to review information from Michael Poterala's presentation on free speech vs. actionable conduct at the last Senate meeting last year. The presentation is linked to the materials from the May 6, 2015 Senate Meeting. Slides 3-4 and 11-14 provide helpful context on the differences between conduct and speech as well as practical suggestions on speech.

Budget Article

Brown reported that the American Academy of Arts & Sciences recently published an article entitled, "Public Research Universities: Understanding the Financial Model." This provides some helpful information on the changing landscape of funding models for public research universities. He encouraged senators to review the article, which is linked on the Senate website for reference.

Senate Elections

Brown announced that the candidacy period for all staff, student, and single-member constituency senators for the 2016-2017 academic year ended on February 5th. He added that voting would begin on February 22nd and more details about the timeline and process could be found under the "Elections" tab on the Senate website.

Senate Elected Committees/Councils

Brown noted that all senators should have received an email from the Senate office detailing available positions on senate-elected committees/councils for 2016-2017. This includes the Senate Executive Committee, Committee on Committees, Athletic Council, Council of University System Faculty (CUSF), and the Campus Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC). He stated that the Nominations Committee is looking for individuals interested in serving on these important bodies. He asked interested senators to visit the Senate website for more information on how to nominate themselves or a colleague.

Spring Senate Meetings

Chair Brown announced that Chancellor Caret would be addressing the Senate at the March 9th Meeting so we have moved that meeting to the Colony Ballroom. We are also anticipating a significant amount of work coming out of our committees over the remainder of our meetings. Please note that the April 20th meeting will be the last for any outgoing senators. The May 5th meeting is the transition meeting where new senators will be seated.

Protocol

Chair Brown reminded everyone that while our meetings are open, only senators may speak. Senators may also introduce current members of the campus community to speak. If you would like to speak when the floor is open for discussion, please approach the microphones in the aisles and wait until the chair recognizes you to speak. Before speaking, please state your name, constituency, and college or division for the record, because all of our meetings are recorded.

PCC Proposal to Establish a Master of Science in Business Analytics (Senate Doc. No. 15-16-16) (Action)

Andrew Harris, Chair of the Programs, Curricula, and Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the PCC Proposal to Establish a Master of Science in Business Analytics (Senate Doc. No. 15-16-16) and provided background information.

Brown opened the floor for discussion of the proposal; hearing none, he called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 80 in favor, 1 opposed, and 4 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Modify the Membership of the University Library Council to Include a Representative of the Division of Information Technology (Senate Doc. No. 15-16-05) (Action)

Jess Jacobson, Chair of the Elections, Representation, and Governance (ERG) Committee, presented the proposal to Modify the Membership of the University Library Council to Include a Representative of the Division of Information Technology (Senate Doc. No. 15-16-05) and provided background information.

Brown opened the floor to discussion of the proposal; hearing none, he called for a vote on the proposal. Brown noted that an amendment to the Bylaws required a 2/3 vote in favor. The result was 78 in favor, 4 opposed, and 1 abstention. **The motion to approve the amendment to the Bylaws passed.**

Special Order: Elizabeth Beise, Associate Provost for Academic Planning & Programs, Draft Strategic Plan Update: Overview of Campus Feedback and Senate Discussion

Brown invited Elizabeth Beise, Associate Provost for Academic Planning & Programs, to give her presentation.

Overview

Beise provided introductory context and information about the feedback that had been received through the website since the comment page opened in December 2015. Beise noted that this plan was designed to build upon the 2008 Strategic Plan and that one of the workgroups of the Flagship 2020 Commission was working on this update. The overarching goal of the workgroup was to take the University through 2020.

Beise explained that the work done so far included surveying groups last summer and identifying eight key stakeholder groups. She noted that the reports from the groups are available on the Provost's website. In September 2015, additional feedback was obtained from a form posted on the Provost's website, and Provost Rankin made a presentation to the Senate. She added that the draft Strategic Plan Update was posted online in December and another feedback page was opened at that time. She invited anyone to provide feedback through that website, which has not been closed.

She noted that today's discussion would be an open forum to hear face-to-face comments about the update, and that there would be another open forum on February 18, 2016 with the Provost for members of the campus community to provide additional comments.

Beise noted that there were a few pieces missing from this draft, such as the cost of implementation, which was intentional excluded until the main principles of the document had been fully developed. She stated that another draft would be posted in mid-March and would be voted on at an April Senate meeting.

Feedback received so far

Beise noted that there had not been a lot of feedback received, but a few themes had emerged that fall into several broad categories. The first category is things that probably should have been mentioned in the draft but were not. Items in this category include recruitment and retention of faculty, the regularization of professional track faculty, the role of the libraries, student support other than academics, and the important role that staff play on campus. The second category is things that are already happening that were mentioned in the Plan but need to be better communicated. Initiatives in this category include MPowering the State, College Park development, and the Innovation District. The third category is the ways that the University's entry into the Big Ten Conference helped academics. Programs in this category include the Big Ten Theater Consortium, the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, and the Academic Leadership Forum. The last category covers places where the text could be improved. Sections in this category include the information about career-readiness, how we measure the quality of our endeavors, and an increased focus on the humanities.

Chair Brown thanked Beise for her presentation and noted that she would remain on the stage to respond to any questions that might arise during the discussion.

Chair Brown recognized Chair-Elect Goodman before opening the floor for discussion.

Chair-Elect Goodman made a motion that each speaker in this discussion of the Draft Strategic Plan Update be limited to three minutes, and that no speaker be permitted to speak again until all others who wish to do so have had an opportunity to speak. This would allow for greater participation by all senators who wished to provide input on the Draft Strategic Plan Update.

The motion to limit the time of each speaker was seconded.

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion of the motion; hearing none, he called for a vote on the motion. He noted that the motion required a 2/3 vote in favor to pass. The result was 71 in favor, 6 opposed, and 1 abstention. **The motion to limit the time of each speaker passed.**

Chair Brown opened the floor for discussion of the Draft Strategic Plan Update and noted that a timer would be displayed on the screen for each speaker.

Q & A

Senator Lathrop, faculty, College of Mathematical and Natural Sciences, stated that the University has grown in research capacity, but the staff associated with research and enterprise had decreased in recent years. He suggested that the number of staff associated with the research enterprise should increase to ensure quality control, day-to-day support, and auditable business practices.

Senator Cartwright, faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, stated that he was in favor of adding language about professional track faculty. Specifically, he wanted the University to declare, as a whole, a commitment to bring the per-course stipends up to the levels recommended by relevant associations. He also added that the University should ensure that appropriate funds for promotion and professional development should be provided for professional track faculty.

Chair Brown thanked Cartwright for his comments

Senator Yotsukura, faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, introduced Fatemeh Keshavarz, Director of the School of Languages, Literature, and Culture.

Keshavarz stated that the work in arts and humanities is not an either/ or situation and that the humanities would very much like to work with the arts. She noted the significant core disciplines such as philosophy, literature, languages, and history are missing from the draft. In addition, new and developing fields such as film studies, gender and sexuality studies, and the field of language should have a significant place in the draft. We need to train students who can read and write and not only use technology, but also engage in the fields and think about them in a critical way. If we would like to be among the top public universities, we need to have the humanities stand out by creating spaces in which humanities can be inserted into the Plan. The humanities needs to be strengthened on campus, because, even if humanities stays at the current levels, we are not going to be in a strong position as a university.

Senator Baron, part-time lecturer, endorsed Senator Cartwright's comments and thanked him for bringing the issue to the Provost's and the working group's attention. She stated that her comments regarding professional track faculty have to do with every section other than MPower, Greater College Park, and Athletics. She noted that professional track faculty need to be better compensated, better recognized, and better integrated into the campus community as a whole. She noted that in the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion section, there is a lot of rhetoric about different career paths and different socioeconomic statuses that does not get the attention it deserves. She noted that she would like to offer a different acronym rather than STEAM which puts the arts into STEM. She would like to offer HEART which stands for Humanities, Ethics, Arts, Rhetoric, and Teaching which comes closer to embodying what the humanities are all about and what the humanities can bring to universities as a whole.

Senator Novara, faculty, University Libraries, introduced Tim Hackman, Chair of the Library Assembly.

Hackman stated that he feels the Libraries can really contribute to the area of undergraduate education because they do hundreds of hours of training on information literacy and research across all disciplines. He noted that the Libraries offer unique learning spaces including individual and group study rooms and maker spaces that students demand and cannot find anywhere else on campus. He added that, while they have come far in this area, they could do much more with the proper support and prioritization. He also stated that Libraries should be included in building state-of-the-art spaces. There is a critical need to support the Libraries' collections and bring the online systems for information discovery and management up to the level that not only facilitates but enhances research. They have made great progress with initiatives such as Digital Repository at the University of Maryland (DRUM), Research Data Services, and the new project IREC, but they could do much more if they had the resources to hire staff with key technology skills. Insufficient electronic systems, like insufficient collections, hinder their ability to recruit and retain top-notch researchers. Finally the Libraries, and particularly the University Archives, have an important role in modernizing administrative procedures. With proper support, the Libraries are ready, willing, and able to help the University rectify its long-neglected need to develop, implement, and maintain an electronic records management system which will keep important systems from getting clogged with old data and ensure that critical documentation about the history of the University is not lost. If the Libraries are to sustain, let alone increase, our support for the mission of the University, we really hope that the University views and treats us as an important part of the strategic plan and mission.

Beise asked Hackman to send text reflecting his comments that could be considered for inclusion in the draft.

Senator Aparicio Blackwell, exempt staff, stated that it is important to have community engagement beyond what is mentioned in the Greater College Park section. It is important to recognize that many members of the campus community work beyond feeding the homeless and working in the Capital Food Bank and really make a difference in the community. They do actual work in addressing social issues in areas that go beyond College Park. It is important to maintain that component of public service as a land-grant institution and capture the essence of public service. It important to point out that the University is doing more than just building new buildings. They are addressing the K-12 population, social issues, and getting community-based projects in the curriculum for classes that have never considered such projects. These projects go beyond the College of Education, School of Public Health, the University of Maryland Extension, and the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources which traditionally incorporate community programs. One example of this is Engineers Without Borders who are getting a lot of community experience. It is important to recognize projects that are doing something other than giving funding and are impacting the community, particularly minority communities where economic impact is the main factor.

Brown encouraged senators to send their comments to the senate office to make sure they are compiled and sent to the Provost.

Senator Hoffman, faculty, College of Mathematical and Natural Sciences, stated that her comments pertain to the Greater College Park section. She noted that this section calls out a number of government agencies such as the National Institute for Standards and Technology (NIST) and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and noted that these were linked as medical institutions. She added that this section was a lost opportunity to highlight the many connections that government agencies have with the university. Generally, she commented that having a very strong physical sciences program is a fundamental discipline that underpins many of the other initiatives talked about in the Plan including engineering, computer science, and health science.

Senator Klank, faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, stated that he agreed with the earlier comment that it should not be an either/or decision between arts and humanities but both. He stated that it has not been noticed that at The Philips Collection, when they had a recent convocation of students and faculty from the University, all of the humanities were represented very strongly. He thinks that we have only just begun to introduce the arts and that, at this point, it would be wrong to see the arts step back for the humanities to develop more. He thinks both sides need to grow more and there needs to be an integration of art and humanities.

Senator Berger, undergraduate student, A. James Clark School of Engineering, stated that he wanted to bring attention to research and scholarship. He noted that there are a lot of new buildings being built which will impact a lot of people, but there was only limited mention about the infrastructure issue with deferred maintenance. He stated that there needs to be a more robust effort to outline what is going to be done to address that issue.

Senator Soltan, faculty, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, stated that he had two general comments. One, there needs to be a more serious commitment to the study and promotion of ethics and values. This is not only important to the humanities, but also to the social sciences, the professional schools, the business school, and the law school. Two, the University of Maryland wants to be associated with fearless ideas, which is great, but it is not reflected on campus or in the Strategic Plan. Adding programs that encourage intellectual risk-taking would be a way to add this to the Plan.

Senator Harris, faculty, College of Mathematical and Natural Sciences, stated that his comment related to the section on modernizing administrative procedures. Many modernization processes occur internally, but much of the administrative work affects the rest of the campus. It is important to make sure that the end result is an overall efficiency for the campus as a whole, not just in the administrative offices. An easy way to deal with this is to push a lot of work out to other people that may not be suited to deal with it. It is important to make sure the interface is still effective and efficient. He noted that he had not heard any queries about how he interfaces with the administration and what things would help from the faculty point of view. It seems to be a rather hermetic process which is a little disturbing.

Senator Kaplan, faculty, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, stated that he would comment on the research and scholarship section. He noted that, in the five years he has

been at the University, the number of full-time equivalents in his department, Economics, had dropped from 38 to 29.5. He thinks it would be great if part of the Strategic Plan would include ways to measure success that included having the capacity to do research and teach at the level of academic excellence that has historically been achieved at College Park.

Senator Cartwright, faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, endorsed the comments that had been made previously acknowledging the importance of ethics and values. He also wanted to underscore Senator Baron's acronym HEART, which gets at the same issue. He noted that there is a desire for more about the academic and educational vision of the University in the statement. He also endorsed the comments by Fatemeh Keshavarz, which reflect the view of the Chairs of the College of Arts and Humanities. He noted that there is no specific mention of the liberal arts in the document. He proposed that in paragraph three, the mission statement, a statement be included that we envision ourselves as a comprehensive liberal arts institution. He agreed with Keshavarz that we should be comparing ourselves to institutions such as Berkley, Michigan, UCLA, and Virginia. He added that there is no such university that does not have a great humanities program. He underscored one comment that the Chairs of the humanities departments made, which is bringing levels of enrollment in the humanities up to the appropriate levels for a university of our mission and stature. There are lots of forces that have worked against the humanities, and the university presents itself in ways that favor the applied and technical sciences.

Beise responded by saying that the Dean of the School of Public Policy was an English and History major. She noted that there are many career paths for those in the humanities. She also mentioned that this is another place where there is work being done to create strategies to identify students in high school that are interested in the arts and humanities early in the recruiting and admissions process. This is something that we have not focused on in the past, but these conversations are already happening.

Senator Clark, contingent staff, wanted to add that it would be good if the draft highlighted the need to get through the backlog of deferred maintenance. He works in many of the buildings within the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences and noted that there are many areas where there are leaks, flooding, etc., which is very disruptive to our business, teaching, and researching.

Senator Cusack, undergraduate student, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, stated that undergraduate students that he spoke to are very excited about the new infrastructure coming to campus. One complaint students had was that while infrastructure advancements are rapid in some other areas, such as business and the technical sciences, there is not a lot being done for students in the social sciences. He would like to see language identifying the disparity in infrastructure between the sciences and BSOS students.

Chair-Elect Goodman, College of Mathematical and Natural Sciences, stated that the section on research says the right thing, but it gives the feeling that we have coasted up until this point, so we are going to keep doing the same thing. There is nothing in the Plan that says we have to keep driving forward. He would like to see an emphasis on increasing

research and scholarship. He noted that our goal should not be just to stay where we are, but to become one of the top research universities in the country. This connects to the goal of hiring and retaining faculty. The Plan does not have enough emphasis on scholarship, education, and research.

Senator Simon, faculty, School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation, stated that she wanted to add to the previous comments on fearless ideas. She noted that there is mention of innovation and entrepreneurship in various places in the Plan. Separately, there is also mention of the innovation district. There should be a stronger emphasis on the fact that we are turning out students who are innovators and entrepreneurs and also encouraging faculty to innovate and take their ideas into the marketplace. She noted that this also contributes to the career-readiness section. A thematic link would help the reader to understand how the University is achieving its goals of entrepreneurship and innovation across the many things we do here.

Senator Montgomery, faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, stated that he has taught at the University for over 50 years. He added that the arts, as they appear in Plan, are very important because the arts and humanities, with emphasis on the arts, has a lot to say about how we are considered. It is important to consider whether or not we sufficiently supply the proper enthusiasm, desire to achieve, desire to create. It is easy to forget that when writing a document such as the Strategic Plan. He urged Senators to think about not just rules, but to the think about creating something that will live on to the next several years.

Chair Brown thanked Montgomery for his comments and for his 50 years of service to the University.

Beise noted that Montgomery was chair of the Senate when the 2008 Strategic Plan was approved.

Senator Kedem, faculty, College of Mathematical and Natural Sciences, agreed with the previous comments by Senator Montgomery. He noted that the humanities, especially philosophy, is important in all fields. The question to ask is how the arts and humanities are incorporated into graduate education in all fields. He noted that many students can talk about their field, but not about anything else. It is important to create well-rounded students that are better prepared for the world around them after they leave the university.

Beise stated that she had an opportunity to attend a workshop sponsored by the National Academy of Engineering and the National Endowment for the Humanities about the integration of humanities and STEM disciplines and how critical this is. This is becoming part of the national agenda in engineering and medicine—infusing ethics, values, and other critical skills that emerge from the study of humanities into extraordinary engineers and sympathetic doctors. A few people from the University of Maryland were invited to participate because of our programs such as the Marquee courses and the I-courses in the general education program.

Senator Locke, exempt staff, stated that her comments have to do with the equity, diversity, and inclusion section. She noted that the Senate Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion is currently working on a charge which might change some of the language in the equity, diversity, and inclusion section of the Plan. She wanted to make sure that the feedback period was open long enough to incorporate those comments. She also added that members of the committee plan to attend the Maryland Dialogues and will incorporate information from that to their work. She also noted that community input should help shape the equity, diversity, and inclusion section. Finally, she stated that there is language throughout the document that will help obtain the private support needed for the identified goals. She continued that subtle comments about need statements placed throughout the document can be more effective than a direct ask later on. She also stated that there are many maker spaces located around campus.

Senator Stanley, undergraduate student, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, stated that it is important that the University is committed to the future generation and believes that there should be stronger language regarding the University's commitment to the environment. Another issue is that of equality, inclusivity, and social justice. Student safety should be a primary concern because students need to be able to live without fear in order to create fearless ideas. This issue is discussed in the equity, diversity, and inclusion section, but the issue of sexual violence on campus needs to be discussed more thoroughly in the Plan.

Senator Cage, graduate student, A. James Clark School of Engineering, stated that her comments pertained to graduate education. She stated that mentors and students need to be trained equally. She added that an understanding of research integrity is crucial to ensure research is done in a quality manner and is aligned with industry standards. It is also important for students to have the skills to perform research outside of the University. This would advance the quality of research that students produce at the University.

Senator Martinez-Miranda, faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering, stated that the acronyms, such as STEM, STEAM, and HEART, should not define members of the campus community and all departments should work together. She noted that, for the fifth time in her career, she is going through the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) evaluation process, and part of this process evaluates the humanities requirements in engineering education. She noted that some students do not see the importance in this, and having an important document that details this will help it to be better understood.

Chair Brown thanked the Senators for their feedback.

Beise encouraged Senators to watch a video called "The Adaptable Mind" about the skills needed for the 21st century and the integration themes that we are talking about.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Brown thanked Beise for her presentation and reminded the Senate that a separate Senate Forum had been scheduled for February 18th from 3:00-4:30 p.m. in the Colony Ballroom (on the second floor) of the Stamp Student Union so that senators can provide feedback about the Strategic Plan Update directly to

Provost Rankin. She will be available to respond to any specific questions and collect feedback at the forum. Like our senate meetings, the forum will be open to the campus community. However, only senators or those introduced by a senator may speak.

Chair Brown noted that all of the feedback will be considered before the Strategic Plan Update is finalized and brought back to the Senate later in the semester for a final vote.

New Business

There was no new business.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

A verbatim recording of the meeting is on file in the Senate Office.