

University Senate

March 2, 2011

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 94

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 February 9, 2011 meeting. Hearing none, she declared the minutes approved as distributed.

Report of the Chair

Nominations Committee

Mabbs stated that the Senate Nominations Committee is still 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 March 11, 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.

Senate Elections

Mabbs stated that the Senate Office opened the online election system for electing next year's staff, student, adjunct, research faculty, instructor/lecturer, and emeriti senators on Monday, February 28, 2011. Unfortunately, the large volume of voters crashed the University's server. The Office of Information Technology (OIT) staff have now resolved the issue and the system is up and running again. Because of the delay in getting the system operational, we have decided to extend the deadline to March 14, 2011 to account for the lost time. Mabbs encouraged all senators to vote by going to <http://www.senate.umd.edu> and asked that Senators encourage their constituents to vote.

Committee Reports

PCC Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Science Degree Program in Atmospheric and Oceanic Science (Senate Doc. No. 10-11-42) (Action)

David Salness, Chair of the Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the proposal to establish a Bachelor of Science degree program in

Atmospheric and Oceanic Science 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 81 in favor, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to Rename the Bachelor of Science Program in General Business as the Bachelor of Science Program in Management (Senate Doc. No. 10-11-43)

David Salness, Chair of the Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the proposal to rename the Bachelor of Science Program in General Business as the Bachelor of Science Program in Management to the Senate and provided background information.

Mabbs opened the floor to discussion.

Senator Bacon, Undergraduate, College of Arts & Humanities, introduced Evan Ponchick to speak. Ponchick stated that the proposal was a step in the right direction and strongly supported it.

Hearing no further discussion, Mabbs called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 77 in favor, 5 opposed, and 0 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to Reorganize and Rename the Departments in the College of Education (Senate Doc. No. 10-11-41) (Action)

David Salness, Chair of the Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the proposal to Reorganize and Rename the Departments in the College of Education, reducing the number of departments from seven to three, to the Senate and provided background information.

Mabbs opened the floor to discussion of the proposal.

Senator Gullickson, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, asked if the proposal would adversely impact junior faculty without tenure.

Betsy Beise, Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Programs and PCC Committee Member, stated that an appendix to the proposal outlines the specific procedures how junior faculty will be promoted under the new structure. The eligible faculty of the individual's previous department will make assistant professor decisions. Associate professor decisions will be made by members of the previous department for up to three years following the faculty member's change of tenure home.

Senator Turner, Faculty, College of Education, introduced David Imig, Chair of the College of Education Senate who stated that for the past two years all constituencies had endorsed the reorganization. Members of the college were given several opportunities to provide feedback. The College Senate has reviewed each proposal. He explained the thorough review process and urged the Senate to approve the proposal.

Greg Hancock, Non-Voting Ex-Officio & Chair of the Department of Measurement, Statistics and Evaluation, presented concerns about the reorganization proposal. He explained that as a result of the proposal, he would gain outstanding colleagues but would also lose identity as a top stand-alone department. His major points included that the proposal was not motivated by clear goals or objectives, and that there is no evidence that the reorganization would achieve any strong goals. He also raised concerns about the rationale presented for the reorganization and questioned why an external evaluation that conducted a comprehensive evaluation to identify strengths and weaknesses was not conducted. He was also concerned about the major operating principles that led to the reorganization, which included a reduction of departments to three or four and that everyone should be included in the reorganization. He stated that the final vote was between two three-department models and does not necessarily reflect strong support of the overall idea of reorganization. Five out of the seven units initially rejected the overall idea of a three-department model, but it continued to be one of the options presented. He also questioned the backwards approach of defining the objectives and goals at the end of the process. He stated that there were better ways to accomplish these goals without reorganizing the entire college such as establishing interdisciplinary centers, creating special incentives for cross-departmental collaborations etc. He encouraged the Senate to vote against the proposal. He suggested instead that the University convene a blue-ribbon panel to conduct a thorough external evaluation, to set concrete goals and objects, to determine methods that are best suited to meet those goals and objectives, and to establish the criteria that indicate whether those have been met.

Senator Turner, Faculty, College of Education, introduced Robert Croninger who stated that he was proud of being part of the dialogue for the reorganization. He explained that it was not an easy or linear process. However, it was an iterative process that was born out of the concern that the College was made up of silos, which reduced collaboration. There was also concern over the sustainability of small programs. There are currently 50 different programs and specializations within the College for 100 faculty. There was a need to create a structure to allow the faculty to work in common areas. He encouraged the Senate to approve the proposal.

Senator Soltan, Faculty, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, asked if anyone from the College of Education could defend the critique of the proposal.

Senator Celi, Faculty, College of Engineering, asked if the faculty had the opportunity to vote against the idea of the reorganization.

Mabbs stated that Dean Wiseman indicated with a gesture from the Senate floor that faculty members were not given an opportunity to vote against the reorganization.

Senator Celi, Faculty, College of Engineering, stated that he found it troubling that they were not given that opportunity because it seems like the decision was forced from the upper administration.

Francine Hultgren, Non-Voting Ex-Officio & Interim Chair of the Departments of Education Policy Studies & Curriculum and Instruction, stated that the process was the most important piece of the proposal. There was no actual vote, but there were many opportunities to voice an opinion of agreement or disagreement of the reorganization. This conversation began well before the reorganization. The silo problem is a long-standing one. The results of prior external reports indicated that reorganization was something we should seriously consider and was necessary. It was clear that units smaller than 15-30 faculty were not appropriate and should be reexamined to increase collaboration and move away from the silo mentality. There have been many markers indicating that reorganization was necessary. She also explained that a qualitative review allowed them to understand what they want to do. They did consider an external review, but it was voted down because they felt the College of Education should make the decision of how to reorganize. She felt it was a healthy process.

Senator Lohndal, Graduate Student, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that he has not heard a specific defense of the proposal. Specifically, why is this reorganization the best one to achieve these goals and what exactly are the goals? He also asked why this model and what are the benefits for faculty and students? He asked Dean Wiseman to speak to the advantages of this particular proposal.

Senator Haring, Faculty, College of Education, introduced Robert Lissitz, who stated that he was formerly the Chair of the College Senate and the University Senate. He commented that he did not see any relationship between the reorganization and a solution to the problems that exist. He suggested that the 50 programs should be strategically reduced prior to reorganization. He also stated that there were problems with admissions, standards, quality of dissertations, advising, but he does not believe that combining programs addresses these issues. He stated that Provost Farvardin's desire to eliminate small departments was a primary motivation for the reorganization. He was not sure whether combining departments saves money, increases collegial activity, or makes the College of Education more efficient.

Senator Yuravlivker, Graduate Student, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, asked if there is opposition and the faculty were not given the opportunity to vote up or down on the reorganization, whether it would be best to postpone Senate consideration to give the faculty an opportunity to vote. He stated that at the moment he would not support the proposal. However, if a vote were taken that showed strong support of the proposal by the faculty, he would be more inclined to vote favorably.

Mabbs asked if Senator Yuravlivker was making a motion.

Senator Yuravlivker made a motion to postpone consideration of the proposal until the next Senate Meeting. The motion was seconded.

Mabbs opened the floor to discussion of the motion to return the proposal to the College of Education and postpone Senate consideration until the next meeting.

Senator Kahn, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, stated that he was in favor of the motion, but we should ask the College of Education to give the Senate a copy of what exactly was voted on.

Senator Stamm, Graduate Student, College of Engineering, stated that he was in favor of the motion, but asked that the College of Education state clearly why merging the units was the best option. He was not clear why merging was necessary. He commented that collaboration could be accomplished without merging.

Dean Wiseman, Voting Ex-Officio, stated that many of the questions raised in the meeting were addressed in the proposal. She also stated that she was supportive of the motion to postpone consideration of the proposal.

Senator Celi, Faculty, College of Engineering, stated that it was his understanding that the motion included an up or down vote of the faculty.

Mabbs stated that she believed that the motion was only to delay consideration of the proposal and asked the proposer to clarify.

Senator Yuravlivker stated that while the motion itself was to postpone consideration of the proposal, it would be in the best interest of the proposal for the College to conduct an up or down vote.

Senator Turner, Faculty, College of Education, introduced David Imig, Chair of the College of Education Senate, clarified that in the Plan of Organization of the College of Education, faculty is defined as the College Assembly, which is made up of faculty, staff, and students. He asked that they ask the College Assembly to take the vote.

Marvin Breslow, Parliamentarian, clarified that the motion was merely to postpone consideration of the proposal. How the proposal comes back to the Senate is up to the College of Education.

Mabbs clarified that we will vote on the motion to postpone consideration of the proposal until the April 7, 2011 Senate Meeting.

Allan Wigfield, Non-Voting Ex-Officio, Chair of the Department of Human Development, stated that he was supportive of delaying consideration so that some of the issues could be clarified.

Hearing no further discussion, Mabbs called for a vote on the motion. The result was 74 in favor, 13 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to postpone Senate consideration until the next meeting passed.**

Medical Amnesty (Senate Doc. No. 07-08-20) (Action)

Mabbs personally thanked the Student Conduct Committee and all of the faculty, staff, and students involved in the process for their thoughtful review of the issue over the past several years. She explained that they carefully considered all of the aspects of the issue, did a trial run of the protocol, and reviewed the results prior to making a recommendation. They have carefully crafted their proposal and thoroughly vetted it with all parties

Nan Ratner, Chair of the Student Conduct Committee, presented the proposal to create a new Promoting Responsible Action in Medical Emergencies Policy to the Senate and provided background information. She explained that the proposal was presented in the Fall 2007 semester. The Student Conduct Committee decided early on to focus their discussion on possible amnesty for alcohol related offenses and not those related to drug use. She also gave an overview of their review of the issue including focus groups, meeting with administrators, students, the Legal Office etc., creating a protocol, and reviewing statistics from the protocol. The Committee concluded that the current protocol did not sufficiently reduce the perception among students that reporting medical emergencies could result in disciplinary action and that the creation of a policy would be the appropriate next step. The Committee unanimously agreed to create a policy that would meet the needs of the students and the University and unanimously approved the recommended policy. The Committee also approved associated changes and references to the Code of Student Conduct. Ratner thanked former Chair, David Freund, Lee Freedman and other past committee members as well as the Committee's Coordinator, Chelsea Benincasa for all their hard work in the successful review of this issue.

Mabbs opened the floor to discussion of the proposal.

Senator Crisalli, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, applauded the collaboration among the campus constituents to develop the proposed policy. She stated that the Senate has the opportunity to codify a protocol that puts health first and helps students in dangerous situations. She thanked the Student Conduct Committee and the Senate for their dedication to this issue and applauded the forward-thinking members of the community for allowing us to reach this point.

Senator Cohen, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, read a statement on behalf of Student Government Association (SGA) President, Steve Glickman. Glickman thanked the Student Conduct Committee and those involved in working on this proposal. He emphasized that the student body strongly supports the proposal. In addition, Cohen stated that the Senate has the opportunity to

potentially save lives and his belief that any concerns are insubstantial considering what we can do to help students by approving this proposal.

Senator Holmes, Contingent Staff, stated that he has served as a firefighter paramedic in the county for over 30 years. In that capacity, he has had to transport students with alcohol overdoses from our campus. He urged the Senate to approve the proposal.

Senator Kronrod, Graduate Student, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that he supports the proposal but wished that the policy was going further. He does not believe that limiting the policy is in our best interest. He hopes that approving this policy will open up the discussion so that we can take it further. He feels that drug use should also be included in the future.

Ratner responded that the Office of Student Conduct still has discretion in these cases. She stated that students should make the call regardless of the circumstance. We can only handle certain aspects as policy at this point.

Mabbs called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 78 in favor, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Adjournment

Senate Chair Mabbs adjourned the meeting at 4:24 p.m.