

April 12, 2012

MEMORANDUM

TO: University Senate Members

FROM: Eric Kasischke
Chair of the University Senate

SUBJECT: University Senate Meeting on Thursday, April 19, 2012

The next meeting of the University Senate will be held on Thursday, April 19, 2012. The meeting will be held from **3:15 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.**, in the **Atrium of the Stamp Student Union**. If you are unable to attend or plan to arrive late, please contact the Senate Office¹ by calling 301-405-5805 or sending an email to senate-admin@umd.edu for an excused absence. Your response will assure an accurate quorum count for the meeting.

The meeting materials can be accessed on the Senate Website. Please go to <http://www.senate.umd.edu/meetings/materials/> and click on the date of the meeting.

Meeting Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the April 4, 2012 Senate Minutes (Action)
3. Report of the Chair

Committee Reports

4. Proposal to Encourage Mediation as a Method for Resolving Sexual Harassment Complaints (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-05) (Information)
5. 2012 Review of the Family Care Resource and Referral Service (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-36) (Action)
6. Proposed Policies for Parental Leave for Faculty (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-32) (Action)
7. Proposal to Change the Minimum Average in all Courses Applied to Undergraduate Major Requirements (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-31) (Action)

¹ Any request for excused absence made after 1:00 p.m. will not be recorded as an excused absence.

8. Revisions to the College of Education Plan of Organization (Senate Doc. No. 08-09-06) (Action)
9. Representation of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics on the University Senate (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-23) (Action)
10. Proposal to Change the Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) Operating Procedure (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-12) (Action)
11. New Business
12. Adjournment

¹ Any request for excused absence made after 1:00 p.m. will not be recorded as an excused absence.

University Senate

April 4, 2012

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 94

Call to Order

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

Approval of the Minutes

Chair Kasischke asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the March 8, 2012 meeting. Hearing none he declared the minutes approved as distributed.

Report of the Chair

Committee Volunteer Period

Kasischke explained that the volunteer period for Senate standing committees was now open. He encouraged the campus community to volunteer to serve on a committee by going to www.senate.umd.edu. The deadline to volunteer is April 20, 2012.

Remaining Senate Meetings

Kasischke reminded Senators that there were only two more Senate meetings this academic year. The next meeting, on April 19, 2012 will be the last business meeting of the semester for outgoing senators. The May 3, 2012 transition meeting will be for all continuing and incoming senators. Martha Nell Smith will take over, as Senate Chair, and the Senate will vote for its next chair-elect and elected committees. The names of candidates running for the various committees and their candidacy statements will be distributed prior to that meeting.

Committee Reports

PCC Proposal to Establish a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Principles of Public Health (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-26) (Action)

Elizabeth Beise, Member of the Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the PCC Proposal to Establish a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Principles of Public Health and provided background information. She explained that the proposal requests the establishment of a post-baccalaureate certificate.

Kasischke opened the floor to discussion of the proposal; hearing none, he called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 75 in favor, 4 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to Establish an Executive Master of Public Health in Public Health Practice and Policy (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-29) (Action)

Elizabeth Beise, Member of the Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the PCC Proposal to Establish an Executive Master of Public Health in Public Health Practice and Policy and provided background information. She explained that the proposal requests the establishment of an executive masters degree program.

Kasischke opened the floor to discussion of the proposal; hearing none, he called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 78 in favor, 4 opposed, and 1 abstention. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Arts in Film Studies (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-33) (Action)

Elizabeth Beise, Member of the Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the PCC Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Arts in Film Studies and provided background information. She explained that the proposal requests the establishment of a Bachelor of Arts in Film Studies.

Kasischke opened the floor to discussion of the proposal.

Senator Gabriel, Faculty, College of Engineering, asked whether the program included filmmaking or just film analysis and history.

Beise responded that the program does not include the actual making of film.

Senator Cooperman, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, asked whether there was a mechanism for allocating space, funding, and directing the program, since the program is jointly offered and administered by two different units. How does this fit into a turf-controlled University structure? Has PCC addressed issues of how the program will be administered in order to be successful?

Beise responded that the PCC did hear about how the two units are collaborating to allocate resources and instructional load. Space allocation is done at the level of the college. In general, these issues were heard and discussed and the PCC had discussed whether what was proposed was reasonable.

Seeing no further discussion, Kasischke called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 76 in favor, 7 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to Establish an Area of Concentration in Conducting for the Doctor of Musical Arts Degree Program (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-34) (Action)

Elizabeth Beise, Member of the Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the PCC Proposal to Establish an Area of Concentration in Conducting for the Doctor of Musical Arts Degree Program and provided background information. She explained that the proposal requests the establishment of an area of concentration in conducting for the Doctor of Music Arts degree program.

Kasischke opened the floor to discussion of the proposal; hearing none, he called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 88 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Special Order of the Day
Ann Wylie, Senior Vice President and Provost
Why is the University Considering Differential Tuition?

Kasischke explained that Provost Wylie had an unavoidable conflict and could not present the special order as anticipated. We will reschedule the presentation for a Senate meeting in the near future.

Adjournment

Senate Chair Kasischke adjourned the meeting at 3:36 p.m.



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	11-12-05
PCC ID #:	N/A
Title:	Proposal to Encourage Mediation as a Method for Resolving Sexual Harassment Complaints
Presenter:	Vincent Novara, Chair of the Senate Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI Committee)
Date of SEC Review:	04/05/2012
Date of Senate Review:	04/19/2012
Voting (highlight one):	1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report 4. For information only
Statement of Issue:	<p>The EDI Committee was charged by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) on September 12, 2011, with reviewing a proposal submitted by an Emeritus Professor. The proposal requested that the Senate consider recommending that the University's Policy on Sexual Harassment be amended to add the option of mediation as a method for resolving complaints of sexual harassment at the University.</p>
Relevant Policy # & URL:	http://president.umd.edu/policies/vi120a.html
Recommendation:	<p>The EDI Committee recommends that no changes regarding mediation, or other process of voluntary dispute resolution, be made to the VI-1.20(A) University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on Sexual Harassment at this time.</p> <p>The EDI Committee also requests that it be charged by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) with further review of the current appeal processes and opportunities for cases of sexual harassment at the University. While the focus of the EDI Committee during this review was on whether mediation options would be appropriate for complaints of sexual harassment, as instructed by its charge, the proposal also briefly mentioned the lack of appeal opportunities for respondents in cases of sexual harassment complaints. EDI feels that a further review of appeal opportunities, if appropriate, would necessitate a separate charge.</p>

Committee Work:	The EDI Committee met with the proposer on November 14, 2011, to discuss the proposal. The EDI Committee researched sexual harassment policies at peer institutions to identify whether mediation is offered as a method for resolving complaints of sexual harassment. The committee consulted with the University's Campus Compliance Officer, who is often the individual to whom faculty, staff, and students report an alleged incident of sexual harassment. Additionally, the EDI Committee consulted with the President's Chief Legal Counsel regarding the University's legal obligations for appropriately investigating cases of sexual harassment.
Alternatives:	The Senate could vote to have a committee re-charged with further review of mediation options for resolving complaints of sexual harassment. The SEC could choose not to charge the committee with further review of appeal opportunities.
Risks:	There are no associated risks.
Financial Implications:	There are no financial implications.
Further Approvals Required:	N/A

Senate Committee on Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion

REPORT

Senate Document 11-12-05

Proposal to Encourage Mediation as a Method for Resolving Sexual Harassment Complaints

March 2012

BACKGROUND:

The Senate Committee on Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion (EDI) Committee was charged by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) on September 12, 2011, with reviewing a proposal to encourage mediation as a method for resolving sexual harassment complaints at the University. An Emeritus Professor submitted the proposal. The EDI Committee was asked to consult with the proposer to discuss his specific concerns about the current process, review similar sexual harassment policies at peer institutions, consult with the Office of Legal Affairs, review research about whether mediation is a viable procedure for resolving sexual harassment complaints, and whether it is already included in the University's current policy, and, if appropriate, recommend how mediation procedures could be implemented in the current policy.

CURRENT PRACTICE:

According to the University's current Policy and Procedures on Sexual Harassment, the University "is committed to maintaining a working and learning environment in which students, faculty, and staff can develop intellectually, professionally, personally, and socially. Such an environment must be free of intimidation, fear, coercion, and reprisal. Accordingly, the Campus prohibits sexual harassment." Sexual harassment by faculty, staff, and students is strictly prohibited. Additionally, sexual harassment may constitute violations of criminal and civil laws of the State of Maryland and the United States. The University policy defines sexual harassment as follows:

- (1) unwelcome sexual advances; or
- (2) unwelcome requests for sexual favors; or
- (3) other behavior of a sexual or gender-based nature where:
 - a. Submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment or participation in a University-sponsored educational program or activity; or
 - b. Submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for academic or employment decisions affecting that individual; or
 - c. Such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's academic or work performance, or of creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive educational or working environment.

In addition, there are currently two procedures available for an individual who believes that she or he has been subjected to sexual harassment: the individual may follow the Informal Complaint Procedures (outlined in Section 5 of the policy), or the Formal Complaint Procedures (outlined in Section 6 of the policy).

COMMITTEE WORK:

The EDI Committee met with the proposer on November 14, 2011, who explained the rationale behind his proposal. The proposal asserted that mediation by non-lawyers is accepted at other institutions, for dealing with such disputes. The proposer provided copies of procedures from Washington University in St. Louis as an example (attached). The proposer maintained that mediation typically produces results that are more transparent to both the complainant and the alleged offender, while simultaneously protecting the rights of both parties. The proposer suggested that, if approved, the mediation should be performed by supervisors or by ombudspersons of the University, and that lawyers need not be involved.

The EDI Committee researched sexual harassment policies at peer institutions to identify whether mediation is used as a means to handling cases of alleged sexual harassment. The committee found that procedures for early resolution, including such options as mediating an agreement between parties, are used at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). However, the ULCA policy clearly states that some reports of sexual harassment may not be appropriate for early resolution, and may instead require a formal investigation at the discretion of the University's Complaint Resolution Officer, Sexual Harassment Officer, or other appropriate official designated to review and investigate complaints of sexual harassment ([UCLA's Sexual Harassment Policy](#)). In addition, the policy for University of California, Berkeley, also mentions the early resolution procedure as a possible option for resolving potential violations of its policy on sexual harassment. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC) policy suggests that mediation may be used in some cases, if appropriate, based on directives to administrators or supervisors who receive complaints of sexual harassments. The administrators or supervisors are instructed to promptly notify Equal Opportunity/ADA Officers to receive advice on investigation, education, mediation, documentation, and/or disciplinary action, if appropriate ([UNC's Policy on Prohibited Harassment and Discrimination](#)). Conversely, after consulting with the Director of the Office of Student Conflict Resolution at the University of Michigan, the EDI Committee found that Michigan does not officially offer mediation as a means for resolution, particularly in cases that involve students ([Michigan Interim Procedure for Addressing Sexual Misconduct Allegations Against Students](#)).

Throughout its review, the committee regularly consulted with the University's Campus Compliance Officer, who is often the individual to whom faculty, staff, and students report an alleged incident of sexual harassment. The Campus Compliance Officer or the Legal Office must first be notified before any action to investigate or resolve the matter can be initiated. Following thorough discussion on this topic, the committee considered developing text that would potentially allow for voluntary alternative dispute resolution process (e.g., mediation), at the instance of the complaining party. The committee considered whether the Office of Diversity Education and Compliance or the Office of Legal Affairs would be able to recommend such action, if appropriate. The committee members agreed that such a provision could not be recommended to operate as a limitation on the rights of the parties nor on the obligation of the University to prevent, investigate, and appropriately respond to allegations of sexual harassment.

However, throughout its review, the EDI Committee also sought legal counsel on this issue from the President's Legal Office. The committee was advised that, while an alternative dispute resolution process like mediation may be well intended and advisable in many types of disputes, mediation is not an acceptable or practical way to handle illegal activity. The EDI Committee confirmed that sexual harassment is indeed illegal activity, as are other types of discrimination.

The President's Legal Office informed the EDI Committee that federal law places the responsibility and obligation on the University to promptly investigate and take whatever remedial or disciplinary action is necessary to ensure that the conduct will not recur. Because the University must act to resolve the matter, it would not be appropriate for the individuals involved with the case to do so themselves. Additionally, the EDI Committee determined that the University cannot legally delay investigation or action while individuals mediate a complaint of harassment. A mediation process could also create a mistaken expectation by the individual parties that the matter would end a certain way if they agree on something, but in reality it may not. The EDI Committee determined that the legal obligation to resolve the matter is the University's responsibility, and it cannot fairly or properly be undertaken by the individuals involved in the complaint.

Based on its extensive research and legal advice, in February 2011, a large majority of committee members unanimously voted in favor of not recommending or inserting any new language to the text of the current policy at this time.

RECOMMENDATION:

The EDI Committee recommends that no changes regarding mediation or other processes of voluntary dispute resolution be made to the VI-1.20(A) University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on Sexual Harassment at this time. The policy should remain as is.

The focus of the EDI Committee during this review was on whether mediation options would be appropriate for complaints of sexual harassment, as instructed by its charge. However, the proposal also briefly mentioned the lack of appeal opportunities for respondents in cases of sexual harassment complaints. As such, the EDI Committee requests that it be charged with further review of the current appeal processes and opportunities for cases of sexual harassment at the University.


APPENDICES:

Appendix 1 – Charge from the Senate Executive Committee, September 12, 2011

Appendix 2 – Proposal from Dr. Tossell, July 25, 2011 (including the current University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on Sexual Harassment and the Washington University in St. Louis Policy on Sexual Harassment)



University Senate CHARGE

Date:	September 12, 2011
To:	Vincent Novara Chair, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Committee
From:	Eric Kasischke Chair, University Senate 
Subject:	Proposal to Encourage Mediation as a Method for Resolving Sexual Harassment Complaints
Senate Document #:	11-12-05
Deadline:	March 30, 2012

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) requests that the Faculty Affairs Committee review the attached proposal entitled, “Proposal to Encourage Mediation as a Method for Resolving Sexual Harassment Complaints” and make recommendations on whether the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on Sexual Harassment (VI-1.20(A)) should be revised.

The University is committed to an environment in which the campus community can interact freely, openly, and without intimidation and fear. The sexual harassment policy defines which acts constitute sexual harassment and outlines procedures for filing a complaint. The SEC requests that the EDI Committee review the proposal and advise on whether the current policy should be revised to include a process for mediation.

Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Consult with the proposer to discuss his specific concerns about the current process.
2. Review similar sexual harassment policies at our peer institutions.
3. Review research about whether mediation is a viable procedure for resolving sexual harassment complaints, and whether it is already included in our current policy.
4. Consult with the University’s Office of Legal Affairs.
5. If appropriate, recommend how mediation procedures could be implemented in the current policy.

We ask that you submit your report and recommendations to the Senate Office no later than March 30, 2012. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.



University Senate PROPOSAL FORM

Name:	John A. Tossell
Date:	July 25, 2011
Title of Proposal:	Proposal to Encourage Mediation as a Method for Resolving Sexual Harassment Complaints
Phone Number:	301 346 2750
Email Address:	tossell@umd.edu
Campus Address:	Chemistry, Bldg. 091, 1102A
Unit/Department/College:	Chemistry and Biochemistry, CMNS
Constituency (faculty, staff, undergraduate, graduate):	Faculty (emeritus)
Description of issue/concern/policy in question:	<p>At present, all complaints of sexual harassment at UMCP are treated purely legalistically, as either informal or formal complaints, which are usually handled by University lawyers. All decisions as to severity of offense and punishment are made by the lawyers. In fact, any attempt by a faculty colleague to Intervene in or mediate a sexual harassment dispute is concerned a violation of university policy and may be punishable. At many other universities mediation by non-lawyer professionals is an accepted, even recommended method, for dealing with such disputes. This procedure typically produces results more transparent to both the complainant and the alleged offender while protecting the rights of both.</p>
Description of action/changes you would like to see implemented and why:	<p>Section VI-1.20A of UM policy and Procedures should be modified to explicitly recognize mediation as an acceptable procedure for resolving sexual harassment complaints along with the informal and formal complaint procedures already described. Mediation would be performed by supervisors or by the ombudspersons of the university. University lawyers need not be involved. It should also be noted in the policy statement that the present informal complaint procedure does not involve peer evaluation of actions and penalties and is not subject to appeal. The alleged offender should have the right to refuse to respond to an informal complaint and demand that the complaint be made formal to insure their due process protections.</p>

Suggestions for how your proposal could be put into practice:	Such changes could simply be announced and placed in the Policy and Procedures documents available online. No new personnel would need to be established.
Additional Information:	<p>I have examined the procedures for dealing with sexual harassment at a number of other institutions. Attached are the UMCP procedures and the Washington University at St. Louis procedures. Although there are numerous small differences in policy from one university to another, all the universities I've examined except UMCP provide for an administrative or mediation (non-legalistic) option in the treatment of such cases. In many cases this option is recommended or required as a first step. The sexual harassment procedures at UMCP were developed in 1991 (in apparent response to the Clarence Thomas – Anita Hill controversy) and have not been seriously updated since. The version promulgated by Acting President Farvardin on Oct. 20, 2010 is very similar to the 1991 version.</p> <p>I have discussed possible changes in sexual harassment policy with Ms. Susan Bayly, General Counsel of UMCP. Although she does not endorse my proposed changes she believes that it is appropriate for the University Senate to consider them.</p>

Please send your completed form and any supporting documents to senate-admin@umd.edu or University of Maryland Senate Office, 1100 Marie Mount Hall, College Park, MD 20742-7541. Thank you!

VI-1.20(A) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY AND PROCEDURES ON
SEXUAL HARASSMENT

APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT 1 AUGUST 1991; Revised
December 13, 2004

A. POLICY

UM is committed to maintaining a working and learning environment in which students, faculty, and staff can develop intellectually, professionally, personally, and socially. Such an environment must be free of intimidation, fear, coercion, and reprisal. Accordingly, the Campus prohibits sexual harassment. Sexual harassment may cause others unjustifiable offense, anxiety, and injury. Sexual harassment threatens the legitimate expectation of all members of the Campus community that academic or employment progress is determined by the publicly stated requirements of job and classroom performance, and that the Campus environment will not unreasonably impede work or study.

Sexual harassment by University faculty, staff, and students is prohibited. This constitutes Campus policy. Sexual harassment may also constitute violations of criminal and civil laws of the State of Maryland and the United States. For the purpose of this Campus policy, sexual harassment is defined as: (1) unwelcome sexual advances; or (2) unwelcome requests for sexual favors; or (3) other behavior of a sexual or gender-based nature where:

- a. Submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment or participation in a University-sponsored educational program or activity; or
- b. Submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for academic or employment decisions affecting that individual; or
- c. Such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's academic or work performance, or of creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive educational or working environment.

In assessing whether a particular act constitutes sexual harassment forbidden under this policy, the standard shall be the perspective of a reasonable person within the College Park Campus community. The rules of common sense and reason shall prevail. Nothing in this policy limits expression protected under the First Amendment, campus freedom of expression, or similar policies. Allegations of sexual harassment shall be judged with attention to the facts particular to the case and the context in which the alleged incident(s) occurred.

Conduct prohibited under this policy may manifest itself in many different ways. Sexual harassment may, for example, be as undisguised as a direct solicitation of sexual favors, or solicitation accompanied by overt threats. Harassment may also arise from behavior that has the effect of creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive educational or working environment. In this regard, the following types of acts, if pervasive and continuous, are most likely to result in allegations of sexual harassment: unwelcome physical contact; sexual remarks about a person's clothing, body, or sexual relations; conversation of a sexual nature or similar jokes and stories; and the display of sexually explicit materials in the workplace or used, without defensible educational purpose, in the classroom.

Sexual harassment may occur within a variety of relationships. It may occur among peers. It may occur where no relationship exists between the parties other than being co-employees or co-students. Especially injurious is harassment in relationships characterized by inequality of power, where one party has institutional authority over the other. Inherent in these relationships is the power and fear of reprisal. Typically, such relationships are found between employer and employee; senior faculty and junior faculty; graduate teaching assistant and undergraduate; and faculty and student, when the student is enrolled in a faculty member's class or when the student is in a continuing position to require evaluation of work or letters of recommendation from the faculty. Such relationships can be immediate or based upon future expectations, for example, the need for future evaluations and references. Sexual harassment may occur between persons of the same or different sex.

Education and awareness are the best tools for the elimination of sexual harassment. The Campus is committed to taking appropriate action against those who violate the provisions of the policy. The Campus is committed to protecting targets of harassment from retaliation.

B. PROCEDURES

1. General Principles.

Preventing sexual harassment is a responsibility of the entire Campus community. The Campus has made this a priority, but ultimately, no satisfactory investigation or resolution of a complaint can occur without the initiative and continuous cooperation of the person who feels injured.

Similarly, allegations of sexual harassment are extremely serious, with potential for great harm to all persons if ill-conceived or without foundation. Procedures which implement Campus policy recognize the potential for harm. The Campus is committed to protecting the rights of the alleged offender as well as the offended.

2. Confidentiality.

All complaints of sexual harassment are to be kept confidential. This means that the complaint will be discussed only with those who have a legitimate administrative or legal reason to know about the complaint. Information related to a complaint also may be subject to disclosure as required by state or federal law.

3. Filing a Complaint.

An individual who believes he or she has been subjected to sexual harassment has several ways to bring this to the attention of the University, and, where proper, obtain redress or protection. There is an Informal Complaint Procedure (see Section 5). There are also Formal Complaint Procedures (see Section 6) sufficiently broad to deal with sexual harassment. These procedures are explained later in this Policy.

Faculty, staff and students may report an alleged incident of sexual harassment to:

- a. the Campus Compliance Officer, Office of Human Relations Programs (405-2839);
- b. a Departmental or College equity officer;
- c. any Campus or University official or faculty member, including the reporting individual's supervisor, the department chair or dean;
- d. the Director of University Human Resources (405-5648);
- e. the President's Legal Office (405-4945);
- f. In addition to the options listed above, students also may report an incident of sexual harassment to the Office of Judicial Programs (314-8204).

4. Responsibilities of the Person Receiving the Complaint.

Any person who receives a complaint of sexual harassment shall not initiate any action to investigate or resolve the matter until he or she:

- a. explains that as a person receiving a report of sexual harassment, he/she must notify the Campus Compliance Officer or the Legal Office about the complaint. The Campus Compliance Officer and Legal Office will have a collaborative and information-sharing relationship regarding reports of sexual harassment. The purpose

of contacting one of these offices is:

- i. to ensure that the receiving person communicates the necessary information to the complainant,(including giving the complainant a copy of the Sexual Harassment Policy)
- ii. to determine what questions the complainant has about the Sexual Harassment Policy and procedures
- iii. to advise who would most likely be the appropriate University Official to handle an Informal Complaint.

b. speaks again to the complainant, after consulting with the Campus Compliance Officer and/or Legal Office. After the complainant has had the opportunity to raise any questions about the Sexual Harassment Policy and the Informal Complaint Process, the complainant will be offered the opportunity to decide which process to initiate.

5. Informal Complaints.

The Informal Complaint Procedure is intended to be a flexible process so that each case may be handled according to the specific facts presented. The Informal Complaint Procedure has no specific steps, time limits or other prescribed requirements.

- a. Depending on the specific facts, an Informal Complaint may be reviewed or investigated by a supervisor or similar University official who has administrative authority over the person accused of harassment, or by the Campus Compliance Officer or Campus Legal Office staff. The Campus Compliance Officer and/or Legal Office will determine who is the most appropriate person to handle an Informal Complaint.
- b. While a written complaint is not required to initiate an Informal Complaint, the complainant will generally be asked to submit a signed complaint. If the matter is to be investigated, consideration shall be given to the situation and the wishes of the complainant.
- c. The results of the investigation shall be confidentially reported, according to the procedures of the Office of Legal Affairs' and/or the Office of Human Relations Programs' procedures, to the complainant, the alleged

offender, the Legal Office, and as required, to the President, the relevant vice president, dean, chairman, or supervisor. Sanctions for sexual harassment may range from reprimand to termination, depending upon the circumstances of the case.

- d. Files will normally be kept for the period of time designated in the record retention policy of the office handling the complaint. Complainants and alleged may ask where and how long a file will be kept.
- e. The person accused of sexual harassment shall be:
 - i. told that a complaint has been made;
 - ii. informed of the specific facts of the complaint;
 - iii. told that the complainant has chosen to pursue the complaint under the Informal Complaint Procedures;
 - iv. given an opportunity to have his/her questions about the Informal Process answered before any review or investigation proceeds;
 - v. given a copy of the Sexual Harassment Policy; and
 - vi. advised of his/her rights to contest any disciplinary action taken against him/her as a result of the Informal Complaint Procedure.

6. Formal Complaints

Formal procedures for resolving sexual harassment complaints are available based on the classification of the complaining person.

- a. Faculty, all categories of staff, and students can file a complaint under the University Human Relations Code with a Campus unit equity administrator or the Campus Compliance Officer, Office of Human Relations Programs, 1130 Shriver Laboratory (405-2839). The Human Relations Code is on-line at <http://www.inform.umd.edu/PRES/policies/vi100b.html>
- b. Faculty members can file a complaint under the Faculty Grievance

Procedure with the Faculty Ombuds Officer, 2132 Main Administration Building (405-1901). The Faculty Grievance Procedure is on-line at <http://www.inform.umd.edu/PRES/policies/ii400a.html>

- c. Exempt employees can file a complaint under the USM Policy on Grievances for Exempt and Non-Exempt Staff Employees with the Office of Staff Relations, Department of University Human Resources, 1100 Chesapeake Building (405-5651). This grievance policy is on-line at <http://www.usmh.usmd.edu/Leadership/BoardOfRegents/Bylaws/SectionV II/VII800.html>
- d. Non-Exempt employees can file a complaint under the USM Policy on Grievances for Exempt and Nonexempt Staff Employees with the Office of Staff Relations, Department of University Human Resources, 1100 Chesapeake Building (405-5651). This grievance policy is on-line at <http://www.usmh.usmd.edu/Leadership/BoardOfRegents/Bylaws/SectionVII/VII800.html>
- e. A student can file a complaint against another student under the Code of Student Conduct with the Office of Judicial Programs, 2108 Mitchell Building (314-8204). The Code of Student Conduct is on-line at <http://www.inform.umd.edu/PRES/policies/v100b.html>

The procedures listed above are long-standing, structured procedures established by law and/or University System of Maryland policy. Unlike the Informal Complaint Process, each procedure sets out specific steps, time limits, and other formal requirements. Time limits may be extended to take into account behavior considered continuing in nature. The location of a file on a complaint of sexual harassment and how long a file may be retained are determined by the particular procedure used. A complainant or person accused of harassment can find specific information about each of the Formal Complaint procedures by calling the relevant office listed above.

Following is a Statement on Sexual Relationships and Professional Conduct. While sexual relationships in the supervisory context are not prohibited in the sense that penalties are attached to such conduct, all members of the Campus community are urged to consider the ethical concerns that arise as a result of such relationships, and to take prompt and reasonable steps to prevent such issues.

STATEMENT ON SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS AND PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

The basic function of a university is the discovery and transmission of knowledge, activities which are founded upon the free and open exchange of ideas. In order for productive learning and the work that supports it to occur, members of the Campus community--faculty, students, and staff personnel--should pursue their responsibilities guided by a strong commitment to principles of mutual trust and confidence and professional codes of conduct.

It should be understood by all members of the Campus community that sexual relationships that occur in the context of educational or employment supervision and evaluation are generally deemed very unwise because they present serious ethical concerns. Many professional codes of conduct prohibit sexual relationships that occur within the context of one's profession. Accordingly, faculty and supervisors are warned about the possible costs of even an apparently consensual relationship. The element of power implicit in sexual relationships occurring in the supervisory context can diminish a subordinate's actual freedom of choice. There is doubt whether any such relationship can be truly consensual. In addition, sexual relationships between a professor or supervisor and subordinate create an environment charged with potential conflict of interest. Questions of favoritism frequently arise. As a result, such conduct may subvert the normal structure of incentives that spurs works and learning advancement and interjects attitudes and pressures that are not consonant with the education and employment policies and principles to which the Campus is committed.



Search

[Directory](#)[Calendar](#)[Quicklinks](#)

Policies & Procedures

Policy on Sexual Harassment

- I. [Introduction and Policy Statement](#)
- II. [What is Sexual Harassment?](#)
- III. [Confidentiality](#)
- IV. [Seeking Advice; Making a Complaint](#)
- V. [Protection of Rights](#)
- VI. [Obligations of Vigilance and Reporting](#)
- VII. [Possible Sanctions](#)
- VIII. [Education](#)

[Appendix: Sexual Harassment Coordinators and Advisors](#)

I. Introduction and Policy Statement

Washington University is committed to having a positive learning and working environment for its students, faculty and staff and will not tolerate sexual harassment.

Sexual harassment is an attack on the dignity of individuals and the integrity of the University as an institution of learning. Academic freedom can exist only when every person is free to pursue ideas in a non-threatening, non-coercive atmosphere of mutual respect. Sexual harassment is reprehensible and threatening to the careers, educational experience and well-being of all members of our community.

Sexual harassment is a form of discrimination that violates University policy. It is also illegal under state and federal law.

This policy applies to all members of the Washington University community. It allocates responsibilities for helping to ensure that University policy is fairly applied, explains the process by which complaints of sexual harassment may be brought forward and provides sanctions for sexual harassment, which may range from reprimands to termination or dismissal, depending upon the severity of the offense. If you believe you have been sexually harassed, Sections IV and V describe options about what you can do and where you can get help. If you believe you have been falsely accused of sexual harassment, the procedures set out below are also available to you. Those charged with implementation of this Policy will, whenever appropriate, encourage and assist those who believe they may have been sexually harassed to pursue the assorted informal means outlined in Section IV below for securing the cessation of unwelcome and offensive conduct.

II. What is Sexual Harassment?

For the purposes of this statement, Washington University has adapted the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) definition of sexual harassment for an academic

[Main Page](#)
[Prospective Students](#)
[Students](#)
[Faculty & Staff](#)
[Alumni, Parents, & Friends](#)
[Academics & Research](#)
[Admissions](#)
[Medicine & Health Care](#)
[Libraries](#)
[WUSTL & the Community](#)
[Athletics](#)

Policies & Procedures Home

[Computing Policies](#)
[Intellectual Property & Research](#)
[Faculty](#)
[Students](#)
[Staff](#)
[Use of University Space & Facilities](#)
[Health & Safety](#)
[Equal Opportunity, Non-Discrimination, and Sexual Harassment](#)

community: Sexual harassment is defined as any unwelcome sexual advance, request for sexual favor or other unwelcome verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature, whether committed on or off campus, when:

1. submission to such conduct is made, either explicitly or implicitly, a term or condition of an individual's employment or academic advancement;
2. submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis or threatened to be used as the basis for employment or academic decisions or assessments affecting an individual; or
3. such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work or educational performance or creating an intimidating or hostile environment for work or learning. Such conduct will typically be directed against a particular individual or individuals and will either be abusive or severely humiliating or will persist despite the objection of the person targeted by the speech or conduct.

Sexual harassment can be verbal, visual, physical or communicated in writing or electronically. Some conduct obviously constitutes sexual harassment -- such as a threat that a grade or promotion will depend on submission to sexual advance. But whether particular conduct constitutes sexual harassment will often depend upon the specific context of the situation, including the participants' reasonable understanding of the situation, their past dealings with each other, the nature of their professional relationship (e.g., supervisor-subordinate, colleague, etc.) and the specific setting. The inquiry can be particularly complex in an academic community, where the free and open exchange of ideas and viewpoints preserved by the concept of academic freedom may sometimes prove distasteful, disturbing or offensive to some.

Examples of conduct which may constitute sexual harassment include but are not limited to:

- requests for sexual favors
- hugging, rubbing, touching, patting, pinching or brushing another's body
- inappropriate whistling or staring
- veiled suggestions of sexual activities
- requests for private meetings outside of class or business hours for other than legitimate mentoring purposes
- use in the classroom of sexual jokes, stories or images in no way germane to the subject of the class
- remarks about a person's body or sexual relationships, activities or experience
- use of inappropriate body images to advertise events

Members of the University community can expect to be free from sexual harassment and thus all members of the University community should guard against it. The fact that someone did not intend to sexually harass an individual is generally not considered a sufficient defense to a complaint of sexual harassment, although the reasonableness or the accused's perceptions may be considered. In most cases, it is the effect and characteristics of the behavior on the complainant and whether a reasonable person similarly situated would find the conduct offensive that determine

whether the behavior constitutes sexual harassment.

III. Confidentiality

The University will strive to protect, to the greatest extent possible, the confidentiality of persons reporting harassment and of those accused of harassment. Because the University has an obligation to address sexual harassment, however, the University cannot guarantee complete confidentiality where it would conflict with the University's obligation to investigate meaningfully or, where warranted, take corrective action. Even when some disclosure of the University's information or sources is necessary, it will be limited to the extent possible. The University will, to the extent permitted by law, keep confidential all records of complaints, responses and investigations. The records maintained by the Sexual Harassment Response Coordinator shall be available only to the Coordinator and, to the extent necessary, to administrators and other supervisors charged with responding to allegations of harassment. Allegations of sexual harassment shall not be placed in student records or personnel files unless, after appropriate investigation, such allegations have been sustained. Records of allegations maintained by the Coordinator which do not lead to formal hearings or personnel actions will be discarded after five years unless there are additional, more recent complaints against the same person. Any records maintained by the Coordinator concerning an allegation about which an accused person was not given reasonably timely notice and an opportunity to respond shall not be used to justify or enhance a sanction, other than an oral or written warning, imposed for a different instance of harassment.

If you want to discuss possible harassment in a more confidential setting or clarify your feelings about whether and how you wish to proceed, you may want to consult a social worker, therapist or member of the clergy, who is permitted, by law, to assure greater confidentiality. Clergy and counseling resources on campus are listed in Bearings, Ternion and Safety and Security on the Danforth Campus. In addition, any member of the University community may contact the Student Counseling Services at 935-5980 for a confidential discussion and, if desired, referral to off-campus resources.

IV. Seeking Advice; Making a Complaint

If you believe that you have been sexually harassed, you have a number of response options, both formal and informal. Some people may wish to pursue informal means instead of or before making a formal complaint; others will not. If an informal procedure is ineffective, the formal procedures will remain open to you. You should select the route you feel most appropriate for your circumstances. However you wish to proceed, you may consult at any time with the Danforth or Medical Center Sexual Harassment Response Coordinator (listed in the Appendix), whose responsibilities include assisting students, faculty and staff with sexual harassment issues, be they general or specific, formal or informal. You may wish to work with the Coordinator to select an approach.

A. Informal Procedures

I. If you feel comfortable dealing with the situation without assistance, you can:

- A. Clearly say "no" to the person whose behavior is unwelcome.
- B. Communicate either orally or in writing with the person whose behavior is unwelcome. The most useful communication will have three parts:
 - 1. A factual description of the incident(s) including date, time, place and specific action.
 - 2. A description of the writer's feelings, including any consequences of the incident.
 - 3. A request that the conduct cease.

Frequently, such a communication will cause the unwelcome behavior to stop, particularly where the person may not be aware that the conduct is unwelcome or offensive.

II. If you would like to proceed informally, but with the assistance of someone else, you may:

- A. Ask the person's supervisor, e.g., department chair, dean, director, housing office representative, academic advisor or resident advisor, to speak to the person whose behavior was unwelcome. The purpose of such conversations is the cessation of unwelcome behavior.
- B. Consult with the Coordinator or one of the Sexual Harassment Response Advisors listed in the Appendix and specifically charged with responding to sexual harassment inquiries and complaints.

These individuals are thoroughly familiar with University policy on sexual harassment and are available to consult with victims of sexual harassment, those charged with sexual harassment, witnesses and supervisors of parties to a complaint. They can provide information about informal actions that might remedy the situation and discuss University policy on sexual harassment and procedures for resolving complaints.

- C. Ask the Coordinator to mediate or arrange for mediation. Mediation is Discussion and negotiation, with the help of a third party, designed to permit the parties to reach a mutually agreeable resolution of dispute. If a person complaining of sexual harassment seeks mediation, the person accused of harassment agrees, and the Coordinator concludes that mediation would be consistent with the University's legal obligations in responding to and preventing sexual harassment, the Coordinator may mediate or arrange for

mediation.

B. Formal Procedures

Whether or not you have attempted to resolve a sexual harassment claim through informal means, you may initiate a formal sexual harassment grievance proceeding by filing written complaint. This process may lead to a formal hearing at which evidence will be considered and witnesses heard. If this is the course you wish to take, the Coordinator can assist you in filing a complaint.

Complaints, prepared with or without the assistance of the Coordinator, can be filed with the following Committees, with a copy to the Coordinator for your campus:

Complaints against faculty or staff:

Faculty and Administrative Affirmative Action Committee
(complaints by faculty and administrators)
Title IX Grievance Committee (complaints by students)
Human Resources Advisory Committee (complaints by staff)

All of these committees may be contacted:
c/o Office of Human Resources
North Brookings Hall, Room 126
Campus Box 1184
935-5990

Hearing procedures are set out in the Washington University Discrimination and Sexual Harassment Hearing Procedures. These procedures may be obtained from the Office of Human Resources or from any Sexual Harassment Response Coordinator or Advisor.

Complaints against students or student groups:

Office of the Judicial Administrator
Women's Building, Room B2
Campus Box 1136
935-4062

Hearing procedures are set out in the University Judicial Code, found in Bearings and Washington University Faculty Information. These procedures may also be obtained from the University Judicial Administrator or from the Sexual Harassment Response Coordinators or Advisors.

Whether or not you choose to file a complaint, the University may be required, or may otherwise deem it necessary and protective of the academic community, to commence its own investigation.

V. Protection of Rights

The University will not tolerate retaliation or discrimination against persons who report or charge sexual harassment or against those who testify, assist or participate in any investigation, proceeding or hearing involving a complaint of sexual harassment. In this context, retaliation means speech

or conduct that adversely affects another's terms or conditions of employment or education and is motivated by an intent to harm the targeted person because of his or her participation in the filing or investigation of an allegation of sexual harassment. Any such retaliation -- or any encouragement of another to retaliate -- is a serious violation of University policy and law, independent of whether the particular claim of sexual harassment is substantiated. If you believe you have been subjected to retaliation in violation of this rule, you may use the procedures described above to complain and seek redress.

The University seeks to protect the rights of all persons, accusers and accused, to fair procedures. Accusations of sexual harassment typically have injurious far-reaching effects on the careers and lives of accused individuals. Allegations of sexual harassment must be made in good faith and not out of malice. Knowingly making a false or frivolous allegation of sexual harassment, whether in a formal or informal context, will be treated as a serious offense under this policy and, where it applies, the University Judicial Code. If you believe you have been falsely accused of sexual harassment you may use the procedures of this policy or the University Judicial Code, where applicable, to seek redress. See Section IV.

VI. Obligations of Vigilance and Reporting

The University can respond to specific instances and allegations of harassment only if it is aware of them. The University therefore encourages anyone who believes that he or she has experienced sexual harassment to promptly come forward with inquiries, reports or complaints and to seek assistance from the University. In addition, any University employee who becomes aware of instances or allegations of sexual harassment by or against a person under his or her supervisory authority must report it to those charged with responding to such allegations and reports: the appropriate dean, director or department head or other similar administrator or to the Sexual Harassment Response Coordinator or one of the Advisors. It shall be the responsibility of these individuals to respond to allegations and reports of sexual harassment or refer them to other University officials for such response.

The University can respond to specific instances and allegations of harassment only if it is aware of them. The University therefore encourages anyone who believes that he or she has experienced sexual harassment to promptly come forward with inquiries, reports or complaints and to seek assistance from the University. In addition, any University employee who becomes aware of instances or allegations of sexual harassment by or against a person under his or her supervisory authority must report it to those charged with responding to such allegations and reports: the appropriate dean, director or department head or other similar administrator or to the Sexual Harassment Response Coordinator or one of the Advisors. It shall be the responsibility of these individuals to respond to allegations and reports of sexual harassment or refer them to other University officials for such response.

VII. Possible Sanctions

Possible sanctions for a person found guilty of behavior in violation of this policy include but are not limited to the following:

- oral or written reprimand, placed in the personnel file
- required attendance at a sexual harassment sensitivity program
- an apology to the victim
- oral or written warning
- loss of salary or benefit, such as sabbatical or research or travel funding transfer or change of job, class or residential assignment or location (i.e., removing the person from being in a position to retaliate or further harass the victim).
- fine
- demotion
- suspension, probation, termination, dismissal or expulsion

While counseling is not considered a sanction, it may be offered or required in combination with sanctions. Where alcohol is involved in the sexual harassment, such counseling may include an alcohol abuse program.

If students or student groups are guilty of sexual harassment any of the sanctions set forth in the University Judicial Code may also be invoked.

VIII. Education

The best way to deal with sexual harassment is to prevent it. Education is essential to eliminating sexual harassment. Washington University has developed an ongoing training program. Please call a Sexual Harassment Response Coordinator or Advisor to find out more about these programs, what sexual harassment is, how to respond to it and what to do when someone asks for advice about sexual harassment.

Approved by the Washington University Senate Council, October 19, 1995. Approved by the Washington University Senate April 22, 1996. Revision approved by the Washington University Senate, April 28, 1997. (This policy supersedes prior University Policies on Sexual Harassment).

Appendix: Sexual Harassment Coordinators and Advisors

(as of January, 2006)

Danforth Campus

Coordinator:

Ann B. Prenatt
- 935-7746

Advisors:

Lorraine Goffe-Rush (complaints by faculty, staff and others)
- 935-8046

Kathy Steiner-Lang (complaints by students and others)
- 935-5910

John Drobak (complaints by faculty and others)
- 935-6487

Medical Campus

Coordinator:
Legail Chandler
- 362-4900

Advisors:
Apryle Cotton (complaints by faculty, staff and others)
- 362-7198

Dr. Leslie Kahl (complaints by students and others)
- 362-7481

Sandra Sledge (complaints by staff and others)
- 362-4937

Copyright 2000-2008, Washington University in St. Louis



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	11-12-36
PCC ID #:	N/A
Title:	2012 Review of the Family Care Resource and Referral Service
Presenter:	Adam Cubbage, member of the Family Care Review Committee
Date of SEC Review:	April 5, 2012
Date of Senate Review:	April 19, 2012
Voting (highlight one):	1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	<p>The Family Care Resource and Referral Service (FCRRS) proposal, approved by the University Senate on March 12, 2010 and signed by President Mote on March 26, 2010, required that an ad hoc committee be created to review the Service during the program's inaugural year. The first Family Care Review Committee was appointed in summer 2010 and asked to oversee implementation of the FCRRS, present an evaluation of the service to the Senate, and recommend future child and elder care initiatives for the campus. The Committee completed its review in April 2011; the subsequent report was passed by the Senate in May 2011 and approved by President Loh on May 10, 2011. This report included the recommendation that, "Based on the annual review and recommendation of the ad hoc Senate Family Care Review Committee, University Human Resources will request funding for the Family Care Resource and Referral Service for future years." In response to this recommendation, a new ad hoc Family Care Review Committee (FCRC) was appointed in February 2012 to conduct a review of the FCRRS for fiscal year 2012.</p>
Relevant Policy # & URL:	N/A
Recommendation:	<p>Based on the current evaluation, the Family Care Review Committee recommends the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contract with Family Care Resources should be renewed in FY13. The current level of funding should be maintained. • The number of free consultations for FY13 should remain at 264 consultations. • The number of campus-wide seminars for FY13 should remain at

	<p>10.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family care presentations and print resources should be offered to units where a majority of individuals do not have regular access to computer work stations (e.g. some staff). The Family Care website should continue to be updated with timely child and elder care information that covers both the states of Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia. Scanned pdf files currently on the website should be retyped or converted to webpage format for visual clarity. A map of Cole Field House with directions to the FCRRS Office should be added to the website. An online consultation request form should be added to the Family Care Website. FCRRS staff should coordinate with University Human Resources to find a suitable venue for each seminar to accommodate expected attendance. FCRRS staff should assess whether seminars that are anticipated to be well attended should be extended from an hour to an hour and a half. Based on the annual review and recommendation of the ad hoc Senate Family Care Review Committee, University Human Resources will request funding for the Family Care Resource and Referral Service for future years. The Family Care Review Committee should more broadly revisit the provision of family care services at the University of Maryland every five years to consider modified, expanded, or new activities, as legal, financial, and service needs may change.
Committee Work:	The FCRC met on March 12, 2012 and March 26, 2012. During these meetings, Committee members reviewed FCRRS activities, consultation survey responses, seminar evaluation responses, and participation statistics for all services offered. The Committee met with David Rieger (Assistant Director, University Human Resources) and Zahira Meyers (Benefits Services Counselor, University Human Resources), and corresponded with Carol Ann Rudolph (Owner and Consultant, Family Care Resources). The FCRC compiled a report and recommendations based on the data gathered from these sources.
Alternatives:	The Family Care Resource and Referral Service could be discontinued.
Risks:	Discontinuation of the Family Care Service may impair the University's ability to attract and retain the best faculty, staff, and students.
Financial Implications:	Financial resources would be required to maintain the Family Care Resource and Referral Service.
Further Approvals Required:	Senate Approval, Presidential Approval

Senate Family Care Review Committee
Senate Document Number 11-12-36
2012 Review of the Family Care Resource and Referral Service
September 2011 to March 2012

Background

The Family Care Resource and Referral Service (FCRRS) proposal, approved by the University Senate on March 12, 2010 and signed by President Mote on March 26, 2010, required that an ad hoc committee be created to review the Service during the program's inaugural year. The first Family Care Review Committee was appointed in summer 2010 and asked to oversee implementation of the FCRRS, present an evaluation of the service to the Senate, and recommend future child and elder care initiatives for the campus. The Committee completed its review in April 2011; the subsequent report was passed by the Senate in May 2011 and approved by President Loh on May 10, 2011. This report included the recommendation that, "Based on the annual review and recommendation of the ad hoc Senate Family Care Review Committee, University Human Resources will request funding for the Family Care Resource and Referral Service for future years." In response to this recommendation, a new ad hoc Family Care Review Committee (FCRC) was appointed in February 2012 to conduct a review of the FCRRS for fiscal year 2012.

Committee Work

The FCRC met on March 12, 2012 and March 26, 2012. During these meetings, Committee members reviewed FCRRS activities, consultation survey responses, seminar evaluation responses, and participation statistics for all services offered. The Committee met with David Rieger (Assistant Director, University Human Resources) and Zahira Meyers (Benefits Services Counselor, University Human Resources), and corresponded with Carol Ann Rudolph (Owner and Consultant, Family Care Resources). The FCRC compiled a report and recommendations based on the data gathered from these sources.

Family Care Resource and Referral Service (FCRRS)

The FCRRS is operated by Family Care Resources, a company owned by child care specialist Carol Ann Rudolph. Ms. Rudolph also employs an elder care specialist, Rosemary Allender. The Service is located in 1116 Cole Student Activities Building, and the family care specialists are also available to conduct telephone consultations with members of the University community. Family Care Resources received a University contract to provide the following services in FY12:

- 10 seminars on timely child care and elder care issues
- 264 personalized, professional consultations for University faculty, staff and students on child and elder care issues, on a first-come, first served basis, at no cost
- A Family Care website with childcare and eldercare resources, including best practices for selecting care providers
- Print resources on child and elder care issues available to the campus community

Seminars

Seven family care seminars were held between September 2011 and March 2012, and an additional three are planned before the end of FY12. Seminar titles are presented below with attendance indicated in parentheses.

- Preparing your Child For Self Care (25)
- Caring for the Caregiver (25)
- Paying Your Child Care Provider (19)
- Aging in Place (no attendance information recorded)
- Dialing Into Day Camps: UMCP Programs and Profits and Non-Profits in the DC Metro Area (25)
- An Overview of Types of Dementia and Alzheimer's (50)
- Family Day Care, a Dialogue on the Benefits and Drawbacks (10)
- The Legal and Financial Aspects of Caring For an Aging Parent
- Types of Preschool Programs to be Considered: Montessori, Cooperative Nursery Schools, Preschool, and Child Care Centers
- An Overview of Living Arrangement Outside of the Home Continuing Care Communities, Assisted Living Facilities, and Nursing Homes

Attendance at the seminars continues to meet expectations (original estimate of 25 participants per seminar), with elder care seminars being the most popular offerings. Anonymous paper evaluations were administered following seminars and were returned by 129 seminar participants. Summary data for five of the seminars, three on child care and two on elder care, was provided to the FCRC (Appendix 1). Ratings of the overall quality of the seminars on a 5-point scale (1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=very good) ranged from 3 to 5, with the vast majority of participants rating each seminar's content as "good" or "very good;" the handouts and written material as "helpful" or "very helpful;" and the extent to which the seminar increased their knowledge as "much" or "very much." For the two elder care seminars in which attendees were administered evaluations, 44% rated the time allotted for the seminar, as "Not Enough," or, "Too Little."

Many additional presentations/services were provided by Family Care Resources at the request of campus units during FY12, including:

- Graduate Student Government (GSG) Orientation Fair for new graduate students
- Table at the New Faculty Orientation Fair
- Elder Care Seminar for the Math Department
- PowerPoint presentations at monthly UHR New Employee Orientations
- Presentation at GSG assembly meeting
- Summer Camp Fair held in partnership with the GSG (approximately 75 parents attended)
- Table at the University Health Fair

Personal Consultations

The Child Care and Elder Care Specialists provided 110 personalized, family care consultations with UMCP faculty, staff, and students in the six month period between September 2011 and February 2012. Consultations averaged 18 per month. This was a slight drop from the average number of consultations from the same period in 2010-2011, but very close to the number projected in the consultant's contract (20 consultations per month). The vast majority of consultations occurred in the campus FCRRS office, but a small number were conducted by telephone and email. The consultation summary (Appendix 2) provides the following breakdown of those who received consultations from September 2011 through February 2012

	Number	Percent
Faculty	30	27%
Staff	54	49%
Students	26	24%

An electronic survey was sent to all consultation clients who provided an email address. Responses were received from 69 clients, of whom 36% were staff, 38% were faculty, and 26% were students (Appendix 3). Among this group, 88% learned about the service from email, 23% from a campus announcement (e.g., FYI), 15% from a colleague or friend, and 15% from a website. Approximately 2/3 of the respondents had received a child care consultation and almost 1/3 obtained an elder care consultation. Respondents rated their satisfaction with the consultant and the consultation on a 5 point scale, ranging from 1=very dissatisfied to 5=very satisfied. Average ratings, provided below, indicate a very high level of satisfaction with the quality of both the consultant and consultation (note that all mean ratings improved between .1 and .3 points from mean ratings available in April 2011).

Consultant	Mean Rating
Promptness in scheduling consultation	4.8
Knowledge of family care resources	4.8
Friendliness/courtesy/respect	4.9
Preparation for consultation	4.8
Communication skills	4.8

Consultation	
Relevance of information to my problem	4.7
Helpfulness of information and options offered	4.7
Usefulness of written handouts and resources	4.6
Convenience of consultation	4.8

When asked about outcomes of their consultation, 16% of the respondents reported that they had recently located child or elder care, 16% had called referrals, and 60% were continuing their search for appropriate care (note that respondents were sent the survey link shortly after their consultation, so many clients may have completed the survey before taking any action on the recommendations provided). Approximately 33% stated that they were coping better with an existing problem and 26 individuals described "other" positive outcomes (e.g., feeling better prepared to navigate issue, aware of more options, had made appointments with elder care

lawyer or daycares/schools). Additionally, 100% of respondents reported that they would seek a consultation again, and 100% said they would recommend the service to a friend. Open-ended questions sought additional information about what clients liked best about the consultations and what could be improved. Respondents praised the quality and value of the service, describing Ms. Rudolph and Ms. Allender as, “wonderfully attentive,” “friendly and informative,” “easy to work with,” “knowledgeable,” “receptive, kind, and helpful,” and “compassionate.” When asked about improving the service, a few respondents suggested increasing awareness of the consultation service, expanding and updating the website with more resources, and expanding the geographic area of potential providers to include more of Maryland and Virginia. A large number of respondents commented that they had no suggestions for improvement of the Service.

Website and Family Care Resources

The FCRRS website (http://www.uhr.umd.edu/Family_care/) is located on the University Human Resources website and is maintained and updated by Human Resources staff with information provided by the contractor. The FCRRS website provides an overview of the Family Care Resource and Referral Service; downloadable brochures; information about consultations and scheduling of appointments; a calendar of seminars and events; and child care and elder care resources. Child care resources include links to: Maryland, District of Columbia, and Northern Virginia referral agencies with lists of centers and family care homes, as well as information about how to research violations and complaints; local licensing agencies; and statewide Child Care Resource Centers. Elder care resources include: links to local Administration on Aging Offices; information on geriatric care management; caregiver resources; housing resources; and financial materials (e.g. Veterans Affairs assistance, information on long term care insurance). The website also provides “best practices” for evaluating and selecting child and elder care services. Finally, the FCRRS provides a selection of print educational materials and resources to help individuals make informed family care decisions. These materials are provided at every seminar, and are available at the FCRRS office in Cole Student Activities Building. Many of the resources present information from key national family care organizations, such as the National Association for the Education of Young Children the National Association for Family Care, and the National Association of Geriatric Care Managers.

Summary

The Family Care Review Committee concluded that the Family Care Resource and Referral Service has provided services exceeding requirements of the FCRRS contract. Seminars have been well attended and positively reviewed. Consultations have received excellent evaluations and addressed the needs of diverse University stakeholders. The FCRRS website has been maintained with up to date information and seminar schedules, and educational resources have been made available to the campus community. The Service has been praised as a very valuable resource for the University of Maryland community.

Recommendations

Based on the current evaluation, the Family Care Review Committee recommends the following:

- The contract with Family Care Resources should be renewed in FY13. The current level of funding should be maintained.
- The number of free consultations for FY13 should remain at 264 consultations.
- The number of campus-wide seminars for FY13 should remain at 10.
- Family care presentations and print resources should be offered to units where a majority of individuals do not have regular access to computer work stations (e.g. some staff).
- The Family Care website should continue to be updated with timely child and elder care information that covers both the states of Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia. Scanned pdf files currently on the website should be retyped or converted to webpage format for visual clarity. A map of Cole Field House with directions to the FCRRS Office should be added to the website.
- An online consultation request form should be added to the Family Care Website.
- FCRRS staff should coordinate with University Human Resources to find a suitable venue for each seminar to accommodate expected attendance.
- FCRRS staff should assess whether seminars that are anticipated to be well attended should be extended from an hour to an hour and a half.
- Based on the annual review and recommendation of the ad hoc Senate Family Care Review Committee, University Human Resources will request funding for the Family Care Resource and Referral Service for future years.
- The Family Care Review Committee should more broadly revisit the provision of family care services at the University of Maryland every five years to consider modified, expanded, or new activities, as legal, financial, and service needs may change.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Seminar Evaluation Summaries

Appendix 2 – Consultation Summary

Appendix 3 – Consultation Evaluations Summary

Appendix 1 - Seminar Evaluation Summaries

Preparing for Self Care

14-SEPT-11

Overall Rating Level - Quality of Seminar	<u>Poor 1</u>	<u>Below Average 2</u>	<u>Average 3</u>	<u>Good 4</u>	<u>Very Good 5</u>	Total # Response/ Total # Participants
	0	0	3	6	8	17/25
Overall Rating Level - Content of Seminar	<u>Poor 1</u>	<u>Below Average 2</u>	<u>Average 3</u>	<u>Good 4</u>	<u>Very Good 5</u>	
	0	0	1	10	6	17/25
How Helpful are Handouts/ Written Material	<u>Not at all Helpful 1</u>	<u>Not Helpful 2</u>	<u>Average 3</u>	<u>Helpful 4</u>	<u>Very Helpful 5</u>	
	0	0	2	10	5	17/25
Extent Seminar Helps Increase Knowledge/ Reinforce what you Already Know	<u>Not at All 1</u>	<u>Not Much 2</u>	<u>Average 3</u>	<u>Much 4</u>	<u>Very Much 5</u>	
	0	0	0	12	5	17/25
Was Enough Time Allotted for Seminar	<u>Not Enough 1</u>	<u>Too Little 2</u>	<u>Just Right 3</u>	<u>Much 4</u>	<u>Too Much 5</u>	
	0	1	8	5	3	17/25

PREPARING FOR SELF CARE
September 14, 2011

What features of the seminar did you find most valuable?

- Conversations amongst the seminar/dialogue with the audience (2)
- Details on laws/rules/recommendations on how to get started (4)
- Tips for assessing readiness/survey (4)
- Tips for preparedness and establishing agreement with your child
- Reminders of the basics needed to get started (3)
- Self-care and prepare for self-care (2)
- How to act for an emergency
- Good suggestions to manage the transition
- Feedback from other parents (2)
- To do checklists (2)
- Practical info--not just theory

Other comments or suggestions?

- Another class on when you should allow teens to stay alone overnight
- A good session
- Provide lists of suggestions for teaching self-care not only when alone
- Great information for me

Caring for the Caregiver

4-Oct-11

Overall Rating Level Quality of Seminar	<u>Poor 1</u> 0	<u>Below Average 2</u> 0	<u>Average 3</u> 9	<u>Above Average 4</u> 13	<u>Very Good 5</u> 3	<u>Total # of Responses</u> 25
Overall Rating Level Content of Seminar	<u>Poor 1</u> 0	<u>Below Average 2</u> 0	<u>Average 3</u> 7	<u>Above Average 4</u> 16	<u>Very Good 5</u> 2	<u>Total # of Responses</u> 25
Helpfulness of Handouts/ Written Materials	<u>Not at all Helpful 1</u> 0	<u>Not Helpful 2</u> 0	<u>Average 3</u> 1	<u>Helpful 4</u> 16	<u>Very Good 5</u> 8	<u>Total # of Responses</u> 25
Extent Seminar Helps Increase/ Reinforce What Is Already Known	<u>Not at All 1</u> 0	<u>Not Much 2</u> 1	<u>Average 3</u> 5	<u>Much 4</u> 15	<u>Very Much 5</u> 4	<u>Total # of Responses</u> 25
Time Alloted for Seminar	<u>Not Enough 1</u> 3	<u>Too Little 2</u> 10	<u>Just Right 3</u> 7	<u>Much 4</u> 5	<u>Too Much 5</u> 0	<u>Total # of Responses</u> 25

Paying Your Child Care Provider

1-NOV-11

Overall Rating Level - Quality of Seminar	<u>Poor 1</u> 0	<u>Below Average 2</u> 0	<u>Average 3</u> 2	<u>Good 4</u> 9	<u>Very Good 5</u> 8	<u>Total # Responses</u> 19
Overall Rating Level - Content of Seminar	<u>Poor 1</u> 0	<u>Below Average 2</u> 0	<u>Average 3</u> 3	<u>Good 4</u> 8	<u>Very Good 5</u> 8	19
How Helpful are Handouts/ Written Material	<u>Not at all Helpful 1</u> 0	<u>Not Helpful 2</u> 1	<u>Average 3</u> 3	<u>Helpful 4</u> 7	<u>Very Helpful 5</u> 8	19
Extent Seminar Helps Increase Knowledge/ Reinforce what you Already Know	<u>Not at All 1</u> 0	<u>Not Much 2</u> 0	<u>Average 3</u> 3	<u>Much 4</u> 9	<u>Very Much 5</u> 7	19
Was Enough Time Allotted for Seminar	<u>Not Enough 1</u> 0	<u>Too Little 2</u> 0	<u>Just Right 3</u> 11	<u>Much 4</u> 3	<u>Too Much 5</u> 4	18

PAYING YOUR CHILD CARE PROVIDER
November 11, 2011

What features of the seminar did you find most valuable?

- All
- FSA Handout
- Share Care Information (2)
- Overview of child care costs with different types of child care
- Question and Answer Session
- The basic introduction to the topic - (just immigrated-1st child-know very little about child care in the US)
- Good intro. to this service. Nice to know the support that's offered.
- Discussion on Tax Credit vs. FSA
- The FSA vs. tax credit info and that free consultations are available
- Not so much the surveys MD vs. DC vs. VA
- Flex Spending Account
- Benefits Information
- Information on tax and nannies
- Contact information for resources and Benefits office
- Knowledge of available resources
- Thank you!

Other comments or suggestions?

- Do you have any resources for helping parents find reputable babysitters in the area? I would foresee that we could have a need for this in the future.
- (it is) my first visit to the seminars. Learned a lot. It is short and clear. Thanks!
- Very worthwhile!
- Info tailored to average salaries of University employees etc.

AGING IN PLACE

December 6, 2011

What features of the seminar did you find most valuable?

- Examples given
- Resources available
- Functional Barriers
- Gave some great insights and some new info I did not know.
- I never thought about the various barriers. I had lumped them all together as one problem - Aging from the perspective of the person.
- It reinforces what I've already encountered. It was nicely organized.
- Contact info for service providers
- Not very valuable
- Available resources
- Some terms were identified.
- Handouts

Other Comments or Suggestions

- More info on how payment may work for services. Thank you for offering the series of presentations and services.
- Thanks
- Good overview of aging in place. Well organized.
- Very informative seminar
- Maybe have 1.5 hours seminars
- Would like more eye contact from the first speaker.
- Include PowerPoint. Dealing with challenging issues. Be Specific!
- Need more details on their fees, plus costs of outside services.
- More specific websites on organizations to do recommendations. Room.
- More specific information and resources. Specifics. Just have lists of resources. Way too general to be helpful.
- Would be helpful to also share specifically how to link to resources outside of this area and how to manage from afar
- I'm really sorry that Carol Ann closed the presentation at 1 pm. I could have stayed and perhaps others could have as well.
- Need much much more audience participation!
- More specific national resources such as websites or organizations
- More specific costs

Dialing Into Day Camp

26-JAN-12

Overall Rating Level - Quality of Seminar	<u>Poor 1</u>	<u>Below Average 2</u>	<u>Average 3</u>	<u>Good 4</u>	<u>Very Good 5</u>	Total # Response/ Total # Participants
	0	0	1	10	7	18/25
Overall Rating Level - Content of Seminar	<u>Poor 1</u>	<u>Below Average 2</u>	<u>Average 3</u>	<u>Good 4</u>	<u>Very Good 5</u>	
	0	0	2	11	5	18/25
How Helpful are Handouts/ Written Material	<u>Not at all Helpful 1</u>	<u>Not Helpful 2</u>	<u>Average 3</u>	<u>Helpful 4</u>	<u>Very Helpful 5</u>	
	0	1	1	8	8	18/25
Extent Seminar Helps Increase Knowledge/ Reinforce what you Already Know	<u>Not at All 1</u>	<u>Not Much 2</u>	<u>Average 3</u>	<u>Much 4</u>	<u>Very Much 5</u>	
	0	1	2	7	8	18/25
Was Enough Time Allotted for Seminar	<u>Not Enough 1</u>	<u>Too Little 2</u>	<u>Just Right 3</u>	<u>Much 4</u>	<u>Too Much 5</u>	
	1	1	11	4	8	17/25
						18/25

DIALING INTO DAY CAMP SEMINAR EVALUATIONS
January 26, 2012

What features of the seminar did you find most valuable?

- Different types of camps offered at UMD (3)
- Handouts and speakers (9)
- Flyers and Packets
- Would have been helpful if there was a listing of all campus camps.
- Scott Welch's advice about safety
- Big improvement over last year's 'Dialing Session'
- Good range of ages covered
- Dr. Brown was an excellent speaker

Other comments or suggestions?

- Keep organizing this seminar every year, please!
- What is Terp Quest?
- Speakers could be shorter in their discussion
- Too much wasted paper
- Would have liked to hear about more camps at UMD, including Arts and Engineering (3)
- I thought there would be more content on HOW to choose a Days Camps
- Provide a list of camps outside the University
- Financial Aid for camps
- What about academic camps? (2)
- Maybe talk about how you started.
- If you could bring back the Summer Camp Fair. That was excellent last year--but if not, this was a good overview of some programs on campus.
- I wish Terp Quest had come though.

Overview of Types of Dementia and Alzheimer's**28-FEB-12**

Overall Rating Level	<u>Poor 1</u>	<u>Below Average 2</u>	<u>Average 3</u>	<u>Good 4</u>	<u>Very Good 5</u>	Total # Response/ Total # Participants
Quality of Seminar				4	46	50/50
Overall Rating Level	<u>Poor 1</u>	<u>Below Average 2</u>	<u>Average 3</u>	<u>Good 4</u>	<u>Very Good 5</u>	
Content of Seminar				9	41	50/50
How Helpful are Handouts/ Written Material	<u>Not at all helpful 1</u>	<u>Not Helpful 2</u>	<u>Average 3</u>	<u>Helpful 4</u>	<u>Very Helpful 5</u>	
			5	10	26	41/50
Extent Seminar Helps Increase Knowledge Reinforce What You Already Know	<u>Not at all 1</u>	<u>Not Much 2</u>	<u>Average 3</u>	<u>Much 4</u>	<u>Very Much 5</u>	
				9	40	49/50
Was Enough Time Allotted for Seminar	<u>Not Enough 1</u>	<u>Too Little 2</u>	<u>Just Right 3</u>	<u>Much 4</u>	<u>Too Much 5</u>	
	3	14	22	4	4	47/50

ALZHEIMERS AND DEMENTIA

February 28, 2012

What features of the seminar did you find most valuable?

- Very Clear and Knowledgeable (14)
- Focus on Key Points
- Excellent focus and handling of Question and Answer Segment (6)
- Description of Vascular Dementia
- Description of Different Types of Dementia (3)
- Tips on Handling the progression (4)
- Description of Types of Medicines (2)
- Definitions and Treatments
- Handouts
- Prevention and Methods of Care (3)

Other comments or suggestions?

- Great Speaker! (7)
- Evening Two Hour Seminar
- Allow more time for questions (5)
- Great Topic, very helpful
- Have Dr. Trifoglio come back and go into greater depth
- Make the PowerPoint slide available as handouts (3)
- I have been studying and using Eat Right 4 Your Type for the past 6 months. Food eaten that don't match blood type cause inflammation. Better maintaining of diet based on blood type may be another tool to reverse Alzheimer's.
- Add ways in which it would be helpful to communicate with people with the disease to be more effective.
- I would like to make an appointment
- Include FAQ's in the packet
- Most of the handouts were for Alzheimer's
- Appreciated how readily the staff responded to my inquiries and really worked to be sure I got the information I needed.
- Great resource for the campus community
- Include more literature on vascular infarct dementia

Appendix 2 - Consultation Summary

Summary of Yearly Consultations Contract Year 2011-2012H			
<u>Status</u>	<u>Child Care</u>	<u>Elder Care</u>	<u>Total</u>
Staff	33	21	54
Faculty	21	9	30
Student	23	3	26
Total:	77	33	110
<u>Consultation Method</u>	<u>Child Care</u>	<u>Elder Care</u>	<u>Total</u>
On-Site	64	31	95
Telephone	12	2	14
Email	1	0	1
Email/On-site	0	0	0
Email/Telephone	0	0	0
Telephone/On-site	0	0	0
On-site/Telephone/ Email	0	0	0
Total:	77	33	110
<u>Referral Methods</u>	<u>Child Care</u>	<u>Elder Care</u>	<u>Total</u>
Email/FYI	45	20	65
Colleague	9	5	14
Former Consult	6	3	9
Seminar	6	2	8
Orientation	4	1	5
Website	5	0	5
HR/EAP/Benefits	0	1	1
CYC	1	0	1
Colleague/Website	1	0	1
Other	1	0	1
Flyer and Seminar	0	0	0
President's Email	0	0	0
Referral	0	0	0
Announcement	0	0	0
On-Site Visit	0	0	0
Camp Fair	0	0	0
Libraries	0	0	0
Committee	0	0	0
Welcome Packet	0	0	0
Self Referral	0	0	0
Graduate SGA	0	0	0
FYI/Colleague	0	0	0
Advanced Program	0	0	0
Total:	78	32	110

Family Care Resource and Referral Service Evaluation






1. Please provide your constituency:

		Response Percent	Response Count
Faculty		37.7%	26
Staff		36.2%	25
Undergraduate		1.4%	1
Graduate Student		24.6%	17
answered question			69
skipped question			0



2. How did you learn about the Family Care Resource and Referral Service?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Email		55.7%	34
Flyer		4.9%	3
Campus announcement		23.0%	14
Friend/Colleague		14.8%	9
Website		14.8%	9
Other (please specify)			9
answered question			61
skipped question			8

3. What was the purpose of your consultation?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Child care		67.6%	46
Elder care		27.9%	19
Other (please specify)		4.4%	3
answered question			68
skipped question			1

4. What type of consultation did you have?

		Response Percent	Response Count
On-site (campus)		84.1%	53
Telephone		15.9%	10
Email		0.0%	0
answered question			63
skipped question			6

5. How would you rate your consultant on the following?

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Rating Average	Response Count
Promptness in scheduling consultation	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	3.2% (2)	9.5% (6)	87.3% (55)	4.84	63
Knowledge of family care resources	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	3.2% (2)	14.3% (9)	82.5% (52)	4.79	63
Friendliness/courtesy/respect	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.6% (1)	4.8% (3)	93.7% (59)	4.92	63
Preparation for consultation	0.0% (0)	1.6% (1)	3.2% (2)	14.3% (9)	81.0% (51)	4.75	63
Communication skills	0.0% (0)	1.6% (1)	1.6% (1)	12.7% (8)	84.1% (53)	4.79	63
answered question							63
skipped question							6

6. How would you rate your consultation on the following?

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Rating Average	Response Count
Relevance of information to my problem	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	3.2% (2)	21.0% (13)	75.8% (47)	4.73	62
Helpfulness of information and options offered	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.8% (3)	22.6% (14)	72.6% (45)	4.68	62
Usefulness of written handouts and resources	0.0% (0)	1.6% (1)	4.9% (3)	21.3% (13)	72.1% (44)	4.64	61
Convenience of consultation	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.8% (3)	8.1% (5)	87.1% (54)	4.82	62
answered question							62
skipped question							7





7. What did you like best about your consultation?

	Response Count
	56
answered question	56
skipped question	13


8. What suggestions do you have for improving the consultation process?

	Response Count
	48
answered question	48
skipped question	21


9. What was the outcome(s) of your consultation?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Found care		16.4%	9
Called referrals		16.4%	9
Still looking		60.0%	33
Coping better with a child care/elder care problem		32.7%	18
Other (please specify)			26
		answered question	55
		skipped question	14

10. Would you use this service again?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		100.0%	62
No		0.0%	0
		answered question	62
		skipped question	7

11. Would you recommend this service to a friend?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		100.0%	62
No		0.0%	0
		answered question	62
		skipped question	7

12. Additional comments:

		Response Count
		28
answered question		28
skipped question		41

Page 3, Q1. How did you learn about the Family Care Resource and Referral Service?

1	A consultant spoke to the Graduate Student Government	Feb 4, 2012 2:07 PM
2	Talk at my workplace	Jan 6, 2012 9:10 AM
3	Maryland Center for Young Children	Jan 5, 2012 8:01 AM
4	FYI	Oct 13, 2011 4:12 PM
5	Graduate student orientation	Oct 5, 2011 10:38 AM
6	graduate student orientation scavenger hunt	Oct 5, 2011 10:16 AM
7	Chance encounter	Jul 28, 2011 12:12 AM
8	Child development center on North campus	Jun 21, 2011 9:19 AM
9	New Employee Orientation	Jun 6, 2011 7:30 AM

Page 4, Q1. What was the purpose of your consultation?

1	both	Oct 5, 2011 10:16 AM
2	Intake. Family planning. Cost of having children.	Jul 28, 2011 12:12 AM
3	learn about services	Jun 13, 2011 2:55 PM

Page 8, Q1. What did you like best about your consultation?

1	The fact that I felt listened and that I was offered strategies to deal in a non-confrontational manner with my elder care issue.	Feb 24, 2012 1:27 PM
2	The understanding of the consultant I worked with. She was sensitive and was able to provide me with useful information.	Feb 4, 2012 2:08 PM
3	Prompt scheduling, convenient on-campus location, wonderfully attentive and helpful social worker (Karen Hansen).	Feb 3, 2012 12:24 PM
4	Carol Ann really takes the time to understand my needs and was well-prepared.	Feb 2, 2012 11:43 AM
5	A friendly and informative discussion that was truly wonderful and helpful for my specific needs.	Jan 31, 2012 10:21 AM
6	The fact that she knew enough to give information specific to my case, not just generalized one-size-fits-all advice.	Jan 30, 2012 9:02 AM
7	She is very helpful and patient, and has knowledge on how to find/select the child care. After we meet her, she still helps us to make calls to day care center.	Jan 26, 2012 4:35 PM
8	The consultant was extremely helpful and easy to work with.	Jan 19, 2012 5:04 PM
9	The wealth of information provided by a knowledgeable and experienced family care consultant	Jan 19, 2012 11:20 AM
10	A wealth of information included in the packet handed out at the meeting.	Jan 19, 2012 10:01 AM
11	The information packet was very helpful, and the consultant had a great knowledge base and was very receptive, kind, and helpful.	Jan 19, 2012 10:01 AM
12	The handouts were very helpful.	Jan 16, 2012 3:37 PM
13	The consultants were very attentive; good listeners who also identified each others' knowledge expertise and gaps. It was a personally cathartic experience to describe every difficult situation. For Catholics, a very similar experience to confession...listening, advice and forgiveness.	Jan 11, 2012 5:18 PM
14	Carol has a very personable demeanor and seems to care. She has a very positive attitude.	Jan 9, 2012 2:44 PM
15	Ms. Rudolph was very organized and thorough. She provided me with a lot of useful information and was able to fit me in for a consultation on very short notice.	Jan 6, 2012 9:12 AM
16	Very knowledgeable about child care services, and had many helpful handouts with local resources.	Jan 5, 2012 6:04 PM
17	A lot of information put together at once - saved me a lot of time.	Jan 5, 2012 1:47 PM
18	The friendliness and caring nature of Rosemary Allender. Also, her eagerness to assist me with my totally different issues between both of my parents.	Jan 5, 2012 12:34 PM
19	Information received and availability.	Jan 5, 2012 12:00 PM

Page 8, Q1. What did you like best about your consultation?

20	The immediate response with detailed information	Jan 5, 2012 11:19 AM
21	Quick response and helpful leads for information provided	Jan 5, 2012 8:11 AM
22	Carol Ann was available immediately by phone as well as by email. Email communication for me is key because of the amount of time I am away from my office. Her knowledge is much appreciated!	Jan 5, 2012 8:09 AM
23	Carol Ann Rudolph was very receptive of the issues and had prompt suggestions. In fact, she managed to connect us with a baby sitter within the same day.	Jan 5, 2012 8:05 AM
24	Carol was very friendly and patient. She provided me with a list of child care providers which I couldn't obtain from the free online databases.	Jan 5, 2012 7:04 AM
25	Lists of resources, questions to ask, etc.	Jan 5, 2012 3:41 AM
26	The personal attention given.	Dec 20, 2011 10:01 AM
27	good knowledge in one place. i feel better prepared to make decisions about child care and can spend more time on finding the right location rather than compiling a list of all the options.	Dec 14, 2011 9:37 AM
28	That they genuinely care about what I need and are so willing to help, even on such short notice.	Nov 16, 2011 3:39 PM
29	I liked being able to have access to these services, and I felt that I could follow up my consultation with additional questions if needed.	Nov 16, 2011 3:12 PM
30	Resources tailored specific to my childcare needs.	Nov 16, 2011 2:34 PM
31	The consultation provided me with plenty of important information, which is important as I'm both an immigrant and a new parent. Carol Ann and the interns were very pleasant and accommodating.	Nov 16, 2011 2:07 PM
32	friendly warmheart communication	Nov 16, 2011 1:47 PM
33	Understanding of my issues, helpful information	Nov 9, 2011 8:54 PM
34	Everyone was very caring, truly aiming to help. It felt great to have this kind of support; as a new mom-to-be the consult helped me start down a path that seemed daunting and scary before! I had no idea where to start, now I do. Plus, making extra phone calls for me will be an amazing help. I rarely have extra time during working hours to make calls, this service will be extremely helpful!	Oct 13, 2011 4:14 PM
35	Carol Ann and her interns are really willing to go the extra mile to help us find a workable solution. It's a huge help and we couldn't be more grateful that the University provides this service.	Oct 13, 2011 10:11 AM
36	Carol Ann and her assistants really took the time to understand my unique situation and offered knowledgeable advice.	Oct 13, 2011 10:10 AM
37	Carol Ann is very sweet, knowledgeable and helpful. I liked the lists of schools she sent me.	Oct 7, 2011 10:18 AM

Page 8, Q1. What did you like best about your consultation?

38	It really helped make an overwhelming process manageable by taking care of the initial legwork.	Oct 5, 2011 10:39 AM
39	The staff was pleasant and knowledgeable.	Oct 5, 2011 10:24 AM
40	Both the child care and elder care consultants were obviously experts and had tons of resources on different options. They were also incredibly warm and kind and seemed to care about my family on a personal level.	Oct 5, 2011 10:20 AM
41	Amount of information and quality of information were fantastic! Also, Carol Ann was extremely friendly and helpful.	Oct 4, 2011 7:17 PM
42	Rosemary spent an hour on the phone with me talking through some concerns about my mother and grandmother. She was so supportive and understanding, and her knowledge and passion for her work was evident in her communication with me. She has followed up several times through email to provide additional resources and encouragement. When families are going through the difficult time of dealing with an aging family member, it is good to know that these services are available to make coping much easier. I would gladly contact Rosemary or the Elder Care service again if any future concerns arise.	Sep 2, 2011 12:16 PM
43	I had questions about a series of very specific conditions in a different state, and I received much more information and guidance than I expected, even though I was not able to provide as much information as I would have liked.	Sep 1, 2011 9:45 AM
44	Learning things I didn't previously know such as the liability that a relative can have if he/she knows there is a dangerous situation involving an elderly relative and they don't do anything about it.	Aug 18, 2011 9:32 AM
45	The consultant was the best part of the consultation. Rosemary was delightful. It was nice to be able to talk to someone who totally understood the issues I was dealing with and was compassionate. The resources she offered were clearly a perk, but the chance to just sit and talk to someone who wasn't part of mom's care team or a sibling who might be offended at what I might say was refreshing. There was no need to be "guarded" at what I said during my discussion with Rosemary.	Aug 1, 2011 7:54 AM
46	Feedback on resources and plan. A supportive ear.	Jul 29, 2011 4:58 PM
47	Rosemary was very well-informed, had experience with the problems I raised, and was very insightful, helping me to understand more about how to handle my aging parents.	Jul 29, 2011 2:37 PM
48	It is very nice to know this resource is available to faculty and staff.	Jul 28, 2011 3:44 PM
49	I thoroughly enjoyed the trusting environment. Though two interns were present, I was made to feel very comfortable...	Jul 28, 2011 12:14 AM
50	Willingness to help given my situation.	Jul 22, 2011 3:50 PM
51	I hope you will forgive me if I take this opportunity to highlight what an outstanding service this is. My wife and I just had our first child. A lot of things about becoming a father are pretty overwhelming, but finding childcare that is	Jul 5, 2011 3:55 PM

Page 8, Q1. What did you like best about your consultation?

affordable, near-by, safe, and nurturing is near the top of the list. Carol Ann provides a service that amounts to a small miracle for new parents. Besides providing guidance on what to look for in a childcare provider, she invested time in assembling a list of licensed providers in our area. But, the really great thing was that she called the providers on the list, and told us which ones sounded promising. Within 3 days of my first conversation with Carol Ann, my wife and I interviewed one of the providers she found and laid down a deposit. I can not imagine a more painless or efficient process. This service is essential for new parents, and would be out of reach for graduate students without the university's support.

52	Carl Ann and her interns worked very hard to find me emergency child care. I had a unique situation and the knowledge of the childcare system allowed them to offer me several options of providers in the area. They even took out time to make phone calls for me to providers that I could afford to hire. I had results that same day within hours! They were very fast and efficient.	Jun 21, 2011 9:22 AM
53	good communication skills; well prepared;	Jun 16, 2011 7:52 PM
54	Very prompt	Jun 3, 2011 6:25 AM
55	Counselor straightforward answers to my questions and concerns	Jun 2, 2011 7:48 AM
56	The personalization and convenience of speaking with an expert.	Jun 1, 2011 7:49 AM

Page 9, Q1. What suggestions do you have for improving the consultation process?

1	Send directions to the meeting place -- most of us don't normally pass through Cole Field House and it is easy to get lost in that building.	Feb 24, 2012 1:28 PM
2	Have more information regarding out of state options.	Feb 4, 2012 2:09 PM
3	None. It is a great service and I hope you can continue offering it.	Feb 3, 2012 12:24 PM
4	None--they are fantastic!	Feb 2, 2012 11:43 AM
5	Some of the staff live in Virginia, so it may be helpful to have both Maryland and Virginia materials available in the future.	Jan 31, 2012 10:21 AM
6	N/A	Jan 26, 2012 4:35 PM
7	It would be great if I could have provided the consultant with an area or a route so that daycare options could be filtered by those criteria. Or to see locations on map to help narrow down options.	Jan 19, 2012 5:06 PM
8	none	Jan 19, 2012 11:21 AM
9	The appointment was rushed and hectic. Although the consultant clearly had a wealth of knowledge about the various child care options in the area, the information was not conveyed in a concise, well-organized and clear manner. Much of the appointment was taken up with chit-chat and time spent with the consultant trying to navigate various websites.	Jan 19, 2012 10:03 AM
10	Maybe have an online scheduling system to improve scheduling procedure.	Jan 19, 2012 10:01 AM
11	N/A	Jan 16, 2012 3:37 PM
12	I'd like to reconnect and hope that I will. Since I'm responsive to email, an inquiry from the consultants at 3 months, 6 months, would be good follow-up.	Jan 11, 2012 5:20 PM
13	Our meeting went off topic. Carol seems to be very chatty, which is very friendly, but it also meant that the meeting ran long and didn't focus on all the issues/questions I had. It could have been run more efficiently. Also, I got mixed messages. At a group seminar she said that her office could help make phone calls to child care providers but at my consultation she said that she couldn't help with phone calls. The hand-outs on child care are very outdated, most of the articles are from the early 1990's. They need to be updated to reflect current problems and solutions.	Jan 9, 2012 2:48 PM
14	more info online	Jan 5, 2012 6:05 PM
15	It is time to go electronic with resources.	Jan 5, 2012 1:48 PM
16	In an ideal world on-campus consultation on a daily basis, but I realize the financial implications of this option	Jan 5, 2012 11:20 AM
17	None. My parents are in New York so they did not have direct experience with local providers but provided me links to find local help.	Jan 5, 2012 8:11 AM
18	none at this time	Jan 5, 2012 8:10 AM

Page 9, Q1. What suggestions do you have for improving the consultation process?

19	Maybe improving U Maryland's web link would be good to find more easily such a valuable resource.	Jan 5, 2012 8:08 AM
20	Everyone's schedule is very busy nowadays. Make the consultation shorter, maybe 30 minutes. Offer the consultation all year round, by appointment. I felt the pressure to choose only from two days. People might need consultations at different times of the year.	Jan 5, 2012 7:06 AM
21	None	Jan 5, 2012 3:42 AM
22	N/A	Dec 20, 2011 10:02 AM
23	None.	Nov 16, 2011 3:39 PM
24	Maybe ask for which geographic area the person is interested in learning about resources before the consultation so that lists of service providers could be prepared in advance.	Nov 16, 2011 3:13 PM
25	Include more of the generic resources online (e.g., finding a nanny service) so clients can review this information prior to the consultation (or email it to clients in advance).	Nov 16, 2011 2:35 PM
26	Some of the information we got was a bit irrelevant for us (a list of day care centers which were outside our zip code, while our region was not represented in the list we received).	Nov 16, 2011 2:08 PM
27	NO	Nov 16, 2011 1:48 PM
28	longer or additional sessions, time to discuss feelings	Nov 9, 2011 8:57 PM
29	None so far.	Oct 13, 2011 4:14 PM
30	none	Oct 13, 2011 10:11 AM
31	Try to keep appointments on time. Some appointments ran over.	Oct 7, 2011 10:19 AM
32	None.	Oct 5, 2011 10:40 AM
33	Larger office space with more privacy.	Oct 5, 2011 10:25 AM
34	Scheduling was a bit difficult; it might be helpful to have more resources on specific child care centers in the area readily available.	Oct 5, 2011 10:20 AM
35	It was great, I really have no suggestions or criticisms.	Oct 4, 2011 7:18 PM
36	None- I was completely satisfied.	Sep 2, 2011 12:16 PM
37	My experience was completely positive. My only suggestion would be to get more people to take advantage of the resource.	Sep 1, 2011 9:46 AM
38	Knowing ahead of time that the benefit is two free hours & family members are welcome might have made me plan better. I would have probably scheduled a time when my husband could attend as well.	Aug 1, 2011 7:58 AM

Page 9, Q1. What suggestions do you have for improving the consultation process?

39	I think the seminars could be taped so that more people can "attend" virtually. Access could be restricted via blackboard or some one other univ login method.	Jul 29, 2011 4:59 PM
40	Excellent process--easy to set up appointment, easy access to parking, and ready resources.	Jul 29, 2011 2:37 PM
41	N/A	Jul 28, 2011 12:14 AM
42	I felt our conversation branched out into tangential issues; would have liked it to have focused on the child care issue more.	Jul 22, 2011 3:50 PM
43	Please continue to support this service in the future. It would also be helpful to improve visibility of the service around campus.	Jul 5, 2011 3:56 PM
44	I suggest that this resource be made more public. I emailed a Dean that didn't even know this resource was available, and it can benefit so many parents trying to juggle so an parenting.	Jun 21, 2011 9:24 AM
45	perfect.	Jun 16, 2011 7:53 PM
46	It seemed about as good as it could be.	Jun 3, 2011 6:25 AM
47	None at this time	Jun 2, 2011 7:48 AM
48	Not sure.	Jun 1, 2011 7:49 AM

Page 10, Q1. What was the outcome(s) of your consultation?

1	A combination of the above.	Feb 3, 2012 12:24 PM
2	My consultation was mainly for information-gathering purposes.	Feb 2, 2012 11:43 AM
3	Will be calling referrals soon.	Jan 19, 2012 5:06 PM
4	Since the appointment was just the previous day, I have not yet had time to go through the packet of materials and begin my search.	Jan 19, 2012 10:03 AM
5	Our family is engaged with an elder care lawyer to establish an irrevocable trust.	Jan 11, 2012 5:21 PM
6	I haven't had a chance to look through all of the materials yet, but I feel much better prepared than I did before the consultation.	Jan 6, 2012 9:14 AM
7	More confident that I am going in the right direction with the folks. Email was not delivered by consultant who stated that there was an issue of her email not working, so followup not done as yet.	Jan 5, 2012 12:41 PM
8	Will follow-up soon	Jan 5, 2012 12:00 PM
9	now have options available to me and am able to figure out if they are financially viable	Jan 5, 2012 8:10 AM
10	We found a baby sitter and still have many others of the suggested possibilities to explore (such as the provided resources for family day care).	Jan 5, 2012 8:10 AM
11	I will not need the child care until the Fall so I am starting early and looking at multiple options.	Dec 20, 2011 10:02 AM
12	Found someone who has a day care 6 houses from me!! Thank you!!!!	Nov 16, 2011 3:40 PM
13	Obtained basic information necessary to being a child care search process.	Nov 16, 2011 3:14 PM
14	Type of care needed is changing so information provided is especially helpful.	Nov 9, 2011 8:59 PM
15	There's only been a day since consult, so no action yet on my part.	Oct 13, 2011 4:15 PM
16	Just had the consultation, so haven't had a chance yet to implement her suggestions.	Oct 13, 2011 10:11 AM
17	Have an appt with one of the suggested schools. Have talked to other parents about this school and have heard good things. Hope to make a decision very soon.	Oct 7, 2011 10:20 AM
18	We are in the process of looking, but it hasn't been very long since our consultation. I'm quite confident we will find care.	Oct 4, 2011 7:20 PM
19	Rosemary gave me the courage to talk with my mother about my concerns and finally work towards making a decision of moving my grandmother into an assisted living facility.	Sep 2, 2011 12:17 PM
20	The information helped not only me cope with an elderly relative, but I passed on what I learned to my stepmother to help her cope with a difficult problem with her family.	Aug 18, 2011 9:38 AM

Page 10, Q1. What was the outcome(s) of your consultation?

21	I'm meeting with mom's care team tomorrow to discuss the hospice options that Rosemary shared with me.	Aug 1, 2011 7:59 AM
22	I shared what I learned with my sisters, and we were all pleased with the insightful analysis of our issues and the clear recommendations for solutions.	Jul 29, 2011 2:38 PM
23	gave me other things to think about as far as care goes	Jul 28, 2011 3:45 PM
24	The consultation actually is ongoing. In a brief conversation with Carol I identified some inconsistencies in my thought process re:having a family. Perhaps some underlying issues there to explain why I privilege having children over having a wife? Who knows...but this outcome/realization has got me thinking more profoundly over the past week about the growing desire to be a father, yet not an equal desire for a wife.	Jul 28, 2011 12:17 AM
25	Information provided was useful. The hard part is getting relatives to get the ball rolling.	Jun 2, 2011 7:49 AM
26	Plan to followup with referral to a local Elder Care lawyer.	Jun 1, 2011 7:50 AM

Page 13, Q1. Additional comments:

1	Thanks!	Feb 3, 2012 12:25 PM
2	I have recommended this service to several co-workers already. I can't say enough about them!	Feb 2, 2012 11:44 AM
3	none	Jan 19, 2012 11:21 AM
4	Thanks for the help!	Jan 19, 2012 10:10 AM
5	Again, I think that this is a valuable service, I just wish that the consultation had been better organized and the time spent with the consultant used more wisely.	Jan 19, 2012 10:04 AM
6	None	Jan 16, 2012 3:37 PM
7	This email promotion came at exactly the right time for me...I was paying the usual limited attention to the barrage of umd emails that come my way every day. It was something about the title of the email that made me look...elder care/child care. That intersection of my individual need and my heightened awareness made me open that email communication.	Jan 11, 2012 5:27 PM
8	Work closely with the university to institutionalize these sorts of processes and options	Jan 5, 2012 11:21 AM
9	Great service for the university to provide. So many of us are in this situation in dealind with elderly relatives.	Jan 5, 2012 8:12 AM
10	This is an exceptional resource and Carol Ann is very knowledgeable regarding child care options.	Jan 5, 2012 8:12 AM
11	I left the room with a sense of empowerment and confidence to find a good child care from a list of current providers. Thank you, Carol!	Jan 5, 2012 7:08 AM
12	Just to keep up the good work.	Dec 20, 2011 10:03 AM
13	Carol is very good lady and very kind to us	Nov 16, 2011 1:51 PM
14	Thank you so much. Rosemary is caring, professional.	Nov 9, 2011 9:02 PM
15	Fantastic idea - I just wish it had been available when I was looking for child care for my first child two years ago! The University really needs to be more accommodating for graduate students who are parents.	Oct 13, 2011 10:12 AM
16	Thank you for this invaluable service!	Oct 13, 2011 10:11 AM
17	Thank you very much for your help!	Oct 5, 2011 10:40 AM
18	The consultants were both awesome. I consider myself VERY fortunate to go to a school with this resource available!	Oct 5, 2011 10:21 AM
19	Carol Ann is awesome.	Oct 4, 2011 7:20 PM
20	Again, I can't recommend this service highly enough. It's great to know that students are offered this service on campus, and I wouldn't have found out about it if I didn't check the FYI email. I would suggest trying different avenues to	Sep 2, 2011 12:18 PM

Page 13, Q1. Additional comments:

	advertise on campus, because not many people check that email and I'm sure there are many like me who would benefit from such services.	
21	I would like permission to have Rosemary come to speak to our Department (Mathematics) and present her "Communicating with Your Elderly Relatives and Friends" workshop. Our director would like to schedule it in mid to late September.	Aug 18, 2011 9:42 AM
22	Very very satisfied. I've met with three different geriatric counseling services in Montgomery County and this was the best session so far.	Jul 29, 2011 2:39 PM
23	I hope to return for a follow up and continuation of our first meeting.	Jul 28, 2011 12:17 AM
24	Very useful campus service. On-campus daycare for infants would be very beneficial!	Jul 22, 2011 3:51 PM
25	Thank you!	Jul 5, 2011 3:57 PM
26	I already extended my appreciation to Carl Ann and the interns but again this service is greatly needed and appreciated so continue the great service, and I hope they will expand this department.	Jun 21, 2011 9:25 AM
27	A great service. I'm moving to UMD from the faculty of Northwestern U., and Northwestern has nothing like this. I wish it did.	Jun 3, 2011 6:26 AM
28	I think this is a valuable service, as well as the seminars. Many of us, I fear, are completely ignorant of what to do in these situations, so this helps raise awareness and knowledge. I wish I'd known about it sooner. Thanks!	Jun 1, 2011 7:53 AM



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	11-12-32
Title:	Proposed Policies for Parental Leave for Faculty
Presenter:	Charles Fenster, Chair, Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)
Date of SEC Review:	April 5, 2012
Date of Senate Review:	April 19, 2012
Voting (highlight one):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	<p>The University System of Maryland (USM) began considering parental leave for faculty and staff. As the flagship campus of the USM, our University is leading this initiative by crafting policies for our campus. The University's ADVANCE Policy Review Committee of the Office of Faculty Affairs, an initiative stemming from the ADVANCE grant, has been instrumental in crafting these draft policies.</p> <p>Currently, faculty members employed by the University are subject to a number of different policies concerning parental obligations. In recent years, the University adopted two family-friendly policies: 1) a policy that allows for automatic delay of the tenure clock for the birth or adoption of a child in 2006, and 2) a policy that enables tenured/tenure-track faculty to work part-time for up to two years in order to care for a child (born, adopted or foster) under the age of five in 2009. The University also has a Policy on Family Medical Leave for Faculty (II-2.31(A)) and the Policy and Procedures Concerning Adoption Leave for Faculty (II-2.30(D)). However, the University currently does not have explicit policies in place to provide for modified duty or paid parental leave for childbearing or childrearing.</p> <p>The Senate Executive Committee charged the FAC on February 22, 2012, with reviewing the draft policies and advising on whether they were appropriate for our University.</p>
Relevant Policy # & URL:	N/A

Recommendation:	The FAC recommends that the Senate approve the Proposed University of Maryland Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Modified Duty (Appendix 1) and amend any current University policies to align with this new policy.
Committee Work:	<p>The FAC formed a working group to review the proposed policies and review peer institution data. The committee reviewed the working group recommendations and met with representatives of the Office of Faculty Affairs and the ADVANCE Policy Review Committee.</p> <p>The FAC agreed that UMCP should lead the initiative to develop a parental leave and modified duty policy for faculty within the USM. They agreed to extend the amount of parental leave from 30 days to 8 work weeks in order to provide the maximum benefit to both parents. The Committee endorses the principle that when the institution employs both faculty parents, EACH of them should be entitled to use the full amount of parental leave authorized for use by the institution. The FAC consulted with the University's Office of Legal Affairs and crafted a policy that outlines the specifics of these recommendations. The FAC met on March 27, 2012 and unanimously approved the proposed policy.</p>
Alternatives:	The Senate could reject the proposed policy and units could continue to handle these situations on a case-by-case basis.
Risks:	If the Senate does not approve the proposed policy, the University will lose an opportunity to provide faculty with an additional family-friendly policy. This could make it difficult for the University to recruit and retain top-faculty.
Financial Implications:	There may be a cost associated with coverage of instructional responsibilities for faculty on parental leave.
Further Approvals Required:	Senate Approval, Presidential Approval, Chancellor's Approval

Senate Faculty Affairs Committee

Senate Document 11-12-32

Proposed Policies for Parental Leave for Faculty

March 2012

BACKGROUND:

In fall 2011, the University System of Maryland (USM) began considering parental leave for faculty and staff. As the flagship campus of the USM, the University of Maryland College Park (UMCP) is leading this initiative by crafting policies for our campus. The University's ADVANCE Policy Review Committee, an initiative stemming from the University's ADVANCE grant and the Office of Faculty Affairs, has been instrumental in crafting these policies. Its work has resulted in two draft policies regarding parental leave and modified duties for faculty.

The draft policies from the ADVANCE Policy Review Committee proposed 30 workdays (6 work weeks) of paid parental leave in connection with the birth of the faculty member's child or placement of a child younger than 5 years with the faculty member for adoption or foster care. The draft policy also allowed for an additional period of modified duty during the semester in which parental leave is taken for teaching faculty and 30 workdays (6 work weeks) for non-teaching faculty.

In February 2012, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) with reviewing the proposed policies for parental leave and modified duties for faculty and making recommendations on whether the draft policies were appropriate. In addition, FAC was asked to consult with the Senate Staff Affairs Committee to ensure uniformity among policies for faculty and staff.

CURRENT PRACTICE:

Currently, faculty members employed by the University are subject to a number of different policies concerning parental obligations. In recent years, the University adopted two family-friendly policies: 1) a policy that allows for automatic delay of the tenure clock for the birth or adoption of a child in 2006, and 2) a policy that enables tenured/tenure-track faculty to work part-time for up to two years in order to care for a child (born, adopted or foster) under the age of five in 2009.

The University currently has a "Policy on Family and Medical Leave for Faculty" (II-2.31 (A)) that applies to all eligible faculty who are covered by the provisions of the USM BOR Policy II-1.00 on Appointment, Rank and Tenure of Faculty. Under this policy, a faculty member may be provided with unpaid leave for up to a maximum of 60 work

days (excluding official university holidays) in a twelve-month period to address certain family issues and serious health conditions. Included are leave for pregnancy, birth, or adoption of a child, or for the assumption of new foster care.

The University's Policy and Procedures Concerning Adoption Leave for Faculty (II-2.30(D)) allows faculty to use up to 30 days of earned sick leave for the care of an adopted child, but does not allow such leave to be used in the case of foster care or legal guardianship. Since it is sick leave, it is paid leave. This leave may be authorized only for employees with primary responsibility for the care of the adoptee. In the event that both adoptive parents are University employees, adoptive leave is only available to one of the parents.

The University currently does not have explicit policies in place to provide for modified duty or paid parental leave for childbearing or childrearing. Typically, workload accommodations for such purposes are handled on a case-by-case basis, which may include use of paid sick leave, annual leave, and personal leave, as well as unpaid Family and Medical Leave. Some units already provide teaching relief for faculty who are new parents. Other units make arrangements to cover instructional responsibilities for new parents. However, many new parents continue with their full responsibilities immediately following childbirth/adoption. Some faculty members report being reluctant to request childrearing accommodations because they are apprehensive about having to negotiate arrangements with their chairs and fear alienating colleagues who may be asked to take on their teaching responsibilities (Williams, 2005).

COMMITTEE WORK:

The FAC was charged (Appendix 2) by the SEC with reviewing the proposal, "Proposed Policies for Parental Leave for Faculty" on February 22, 2012, which included both a proposed UMCP Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and a proposed UMCP Policy on Modified Duties for New Parents. The SEC asked the FAC to review the proposed UMCP policies and advise on whether they were appropriate for the University.

The FAC formed a working group to review the proposed policies, data collected by the Office of Faculty Affairs on peer institutions, and make suggestions to the full committee. This group recommended that the policies be altered so that they apply equally to both parents in situations where the University employs them both.

The FAC reviewed the recommendations of the working group. In addition, they met with representatives of the Office of Faculty Affairs and the ADVANCE Policy Review Committee on the impact of these new policies on our faculty. The FAC agreed that UMCP should lead the initiative to develop a parental leave and modified duty policy for faculty within the USM. They recommended that the two draft policies be combined to address both parental leave and modified duty for faculty so that they would provide the

maximum benefit to both parents. This included extending the amount of parental leave from 30 days to 8 work weeks and enabling faculty to use existing forms of leave towards parental leave. The Committee endorses the principle that when the institution employs both faculty parents, EACH of them should be entitled to use the full amount of parental leave authorized for use by the institution. Not to allow this would advantage faculty couples in which one member of the couple works at another institution with a comparable parental leave policy, and unfairly disadvantages faculty couples that both work at College Park. This result would counter the intent of offering a family-friendly policy for the purpose of faculty working on this campus. The FAC consulted with the University's Office of Legal Affairs and crafted a policy that outlines the specifics of these recommendations.

RATIONALE:

The proposed policy reflects a growing movement in higher education to offer family friendly policies as a means of attracting and retaining highly talented faculty members (University of Michigan Center for the Education of Women, 2008). Recent studies reveal that many of the best and brightest women from top-ranked doctoral programs are not applying for academic positions in research universities because they do not believe they can balance the demands of work and family life (Mason, Goulden & Frasch, 2009). For example, in one recent study of more than 8,300 doctoral students at University of California campuses, only 29% of women and 46% of men perceived academic positions in research institutions to be somewhat or very family friendly. Among doctoral students who were parents and supported by federal grants (e.g., NSF, NIH), views about the desirability of careers at research universities were even bleaker--only 16% of women and 35% of men perceived careers at research-intensive institutions to be family friendly. The study also found that a significant percentage of doctoral students who sought to pursue academic careers with a research emphasis when they began their Ph.D. programs later shifted their career goals to positions outside academe (e.g., business, government, industry). The shift away from interest in academe was greatest among doctoral women in the sciences, a finding deemed "particularly troubling given the low numbers of women in doctoral programs in physical science, technology, engineering, and mathematics" (Mason et al., 2009, p. 2).

Studies using data from the national Survey of Doctorate Recipients (NSF 1995, 1999) further reveal that for women with Ph.D.s, the combination of marriage and childrearing dramatically decreases women's likelihood of entering a tenure-track position (Goulden, Mason & Wolfinger, 2005). Moreover, for faculty in tenure track positions, men are 20% more likely to achieve tenure than women. Women who had babies early in their academic careers were less likely to obtain tenure than those who delayed childrearing. However, postponing pregnancy and childbirth until the receipt of tenure is biologically problematic for many women and is likely to become even more so in the future. The

average age of obtaining tenure in the sciences and social sciences has increased from 36 in 1985 to more than 39 in 1999. The average age of a Ph.D. recipient has likewise increased from 31 to 33 in the last two decades. Thus, the challenges of timing faculty careers and family formation are likely to intensify for future generations of Ph.D. students.

Women currently comprise more than half of all U.S. Ph.D.s and underrepresented minorities are an increasing percentage of all doctorates. Surveys indicate that both of these groups have a strong interest in family accommodations (Cockrell, 2006). An increasing number of male faculty members are also interested in taking leave to participate in rearing their young children. Research universities that have adopted flexible work arrangements are positioning themselves to keep talented faculty, and particularly women, in the academic pipeline. These institutions also claim to be preparing themselves for a future hiring-boom, as large numbers of faculty plan to retire during the next decade.

PEER INSTITUTIONS:

In response to this research, institutions such as the University of California, Berkeley have taken a leadership role in establishing family accommodation policies for childbearing and childrearing, declaring them to be “fundamental to an equitable and productive academic environment” (UC Berkeley, APM-760-0).

Using data compiled by the Office of Faculty Affairs, the FAC reviewed a variety of faculty leave policies related to childbirth, adoption, or foster care at our peer institutions. Research universities across the nation have recognized the challenges of balancing work and family careers. Many have implemented policies that provide more flexible work arrangements, such as parental leaves or modified duty to accommodate childbearing and care of young children.

Among the universities that have adopted modified duty and/or parental leave policies are the University of California campuses, University of Michigan, MIT, Stanford, New York University, Rutgers, Boston University, University of Texas/Austin, and University of Kansas. The Center for the Education of Women at the University of Michigan found that 32% of research universities in their *Faculty Worklife Policy Study* offered faculty a paid modified duty option as one component of their family-friendly initiatives (Smith and Waltman, 2006). Within the University System of Maryland (USM), the University of Maryland Baltimore County (UMBC) adopted a set of family-leave practices for faculty in 2005, with options similar to those being proposed by the FAC.

Following a thorough examination of parental leave research, the FAC concluded that the proposed policy is comparable to peer institution policies and will allow our University to remain competitive in the recruitment and retention of top faculty. The

proposed policy is also consistent with the American Association of University Professors' "Statement of Principles on Family Responsibilities and Academic Work." Specifically, the Association encourages institutions to adopt policies providing full-time faculty members, regardless of their tenure status, with short-term periods of modified duty at full pay to address family responsibilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the attached policy, Proposed University of Maryland Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Modified Duty (Appendix 1), be approved for the University of Maryland College Park. In addition, current University leave policies for faculty employees should be amended to align with this new policy.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Proposed University of Maryland Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Modified Duty

Appendix 2 – Proposed Policies for Parental Leave for Faculty Charge from the Senate Executive Committee, February 22, 2012

Appendix 3 – Proposed UMCP Policy on Faculty Parental Leave (drafted by the ADVANCE Policy Review Committee)

Appendix 4 – Proposed UMCP Policy on Modified Duties for New Parents (drafted by the ADVANCE Policy Review Committee)

References

American Association of University Professors (2001, May). *Statement of Principles on Family Responsibilities and Academic Work*.

Cockrell, C. (2006, April 13). Family-friendly policies for faculty are now “an entitlement.” *Berkeleyan*, University of California, Berkeley.

Goulden, M., Mason, M.A., & Wolfinger, N. (2005). Do babies matter: Refining gender equity in the academy. In *Mentoring for Academic Careers in Engineering: Proceedings of the PAESMEM/Stanford School of Engineering Workshop* (pages 89-105). Santa Barbara, CA: Grayphics Publishing.

Mason, M.A., Goulden, M., & Frasch, K. (2009). Why graduate students reject the fast track. *Academe*, 95(1), 1-8.

Smith, G.C. & Waltman, J.A. (2006). Designing and implementing family-friendly policies in higher education. The Center for Education of Women, University of Michigan.

University of Michigan Center for the Education of Women. (2007, December). *Family friendly policies in higher education: A five-year report*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Williams, J. C. (2005, February 7). Are your parental-leave policies legal? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

APPENDIX 1

Proposed University of Maryland Policy on Faculty Parental Leave and Modified Duty

- I. Eligibility. This policy applies to all full-time and part-time tenured and tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty with appointments for at least 50% FTE. To be eligible for parental leave, a faculty member must have been employed with the institution for at least six (6) months.
- II. Paid Parental Leave
 - A. Eligible faculty, male or female, are entitled to receive paid Parental Leave of up to 8 work weeks in connection with the birth of the faculty member's child, or the placement of a child younger than six (6) years of age, with the faculty member for adoption or foster care, provided that the faculty member will be responsible for more than 50% of the care of said child during the period of parental leave.
 - B. No institutional work-related duties are required of the faculty member by the University while he/she is on paid Parental Leave.
 - C. Parental leave is available to eligible faculty within the first twelve (12) months following the birth or placement of a child for adoption or foster care. Use of paid parental leave does not require the faculty member to submit medical documentation.
 - D. Parental leave shall be charged to an individual faculty member's accrued annual leave, accrued sick leave or collegial leave, if applicable, where such leave is available.
 - E. While parental leave is available to both parents and not just the birth mother, a birth mother may also be eligible to use accrued sick leave and/or collegial leave in the event of medically documented complications or illnesses related to pregnancy, such as severe morning sickness, the need for prenatal care, childbirth and the recovery from childbirth. Use of accrued sick leave and/or collegial leave for such purposes shall not diminish the amount of parental leave to which the parent is entitled.
 - F. When both parents have faculty status at the institution, each eligible parent shall be entitled to a separate, individual, period of parental leave of up to 8 work weeks. The amount of leave for which one parent may be eligible, or the amount of leave used by one parent, shall not limit the leave amount or the leave usage by the other parent. Given the requirement that use of parental leave requires the eligible faculty member to be the primary care giver (more than 50% responsible for the care of the child) during the period of leave, parents shall only be entitled to take leave in succession, with the following exception: A parent may take parental leave concurrently with another parent who is taking accrued sick leave and/or collegial leave for the reasons outlined in Section II.(E) above.

III. Modified Duty

- A. Faculty eligible for the benefits of this policy may also request a period of time during which their institutional work duties are reduced or modified without a reduction of salary. This period of Modified Duty is not leave, but rather a temporary reduction in institutional workload without a reduction in pay, intended to aid the faculty member in adjusting to the demands of parenting a newborn, adopted, or foster care child under six (6) years of age.
- B. Faculty with instructional responsibilities (including tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track instructors and lecturers) are entitled to a release from classroom teaching duties and service responsibilities during the semester in which parental leave is taken. For example, faculty taking parental leave for the initial eight (8) weeks of an academic semester, may be eligible for modified duty during the remaining weeks of the semester, i.e., no classroom teaching responsibilities.
 - 1. During the period of modified duty, faculty members with instructional responsibilities are expected to continue to perform other non-classroom instructional duties for which they are ordinarily responsible, such as advising graduate students, as well as to sustain their research/creative activities as applicable during this period.
 - 2. Instructional faculty utilizing modified duty pursuant to this policy shall not be required to offset the reduced classroom course load during the period of modified duty by making up the load in another semester.
- C. Faculty without instructional responsibilities are entitled to a period of Modified Duty of up to six (6) weeks in addition to the eight (8) weeks of paid Parental Leave, subject to any limits established by contract or grant by the funding agency responsible for a research faculty member's salary support. The exact nature and schedule of the Modified Duty of faculty without instructional responsibilities shall be defined and approved in consultation with the faculty member's chair or unit head.
- D. The period of eligibility for Modified Duty will normally extend from 3 months prior to 12 months following the birth or placement of a child for adoption or foster care.

IV. General Rules and Procedures.

- A. The combined period of use of Paid Parental Leave and Modified Duty must be concluded within twelve (12) months of the birth or placement of the child for adoption or foster care.
- B. In the event both eligible parents work at the institution, a period of Modified Duty is available to both, on a sequential basis, provided the faculty member on Modified Duty is responsible for more than 50% of the care of the child during normal working hours during that period. Both parents are expected to coordinate leave arrangements so that the combined periods of Parental Leave and Modified Duty are not exceeded.
- C. Faculty may apply to use Paid Parental Leave and Modified Duty by notifying their department/unit head. To minimize hardship on the department/unit, faculty

are expected to notify their chair or unit head, and, if applicable, the Dean, at least two (2) months in advance of the date of expected use. Notice should include the projected date of birth of the child or the expected date of the child's placement through adoption or foster care, as feasible.

- D. Paid Parental Leave and Modified Duty are benefits available to eligible faculty for use in combination, separately, and in either sequence, assuming other conditions of use are met.
- E. A faculty member's use of either Paid Parental Leave and/or Modified Duty may not be a negative consideration in any promotion and tenure proceeding.
- F. Other policies that may be relevant to faculty pertaining to the birth, adoption or foster care of a young child are referenced below:

II-2.30(D) UMCP Policy and Procedures Concerning Adoption Leave for Faculty

<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii230d.html>

II-2.31(A) University of Maryland Policy on Family and Medical Leave for Faculty <http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii231a.html>

II-1.00(D) University of Maryland Policy on Extension of Time for Tenure Review Due to Personal and Professional Circumstances

<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii100d.html>

II-1.10(A) University of Maryland Policy for Part-Time Status of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Due to Childrearing Responsibilities

<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii110a.html>

II-2.30 Policy on Accident Leave and Creditable and Non-Creditable Sick Leave for Faculty Members

<http://www.usmh.usmd.edu/regents/bylaws/SectionII/II230.html>

II-2.30(A) University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for Non-Creditable Sick Leave for Faculty Members

<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii230a.html>

II-2.20(A) UMCP Guidelines and Procedures for Faculty Leave of Absence Without Pay

<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii220a.html>



**University Senate
CHARGE**

Date:	February 22, 2012
To:	Charles Fenster Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee
From:	Eric Kasischke Chair, University Senate 
Subject:	Proposed Policies for Parental Leave for Faculty
Senate Document #:	11-12-32
Deadline:	March 30, 2012

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) requests that the Faculty Affairs Committee review the attached draft policies for parental leave and modified duties for faculty and make recommendations on whether the draft policies are appropriate.

The University System of Maryland has been considering parental leave for faculty and staff. As the flagship campus of the USM, our University is leading the initiative by crafting policies for our campus. The University's Policy Review Committee of the Office of Faculty Affairs, an initiative stemming from the ADVANCE grant, has been instrumental in crafting these draft policies. The attached proposed policies address paid parental leave and modified duties for faculty. The SEC requests that the Faculty Affairs Committee review the proposed new policies to determine whether they are appropriate.

Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Review similar policies for parental leave at our peer institutions.
2. Consult with the University's Office of Faculty Affairs and the University's ADVANCE Policy Review Committee on the impact of these new policies on our faculty.
3. Consult with the Senate's Staff Affairs Committee to ensure uniformity amongst policies for faculty and staff.
4. Review whether the proposed new policies align with the USM Policy.
5. Review whether additional UMCP policies must be amended to accommodate the new policies.
6. Consult with the University's Office of Legal Affairs.

7. If appropriate, recommend whether the proposed policies should be revised.

We ask that you submit your report and recommendations to the Senate Office no later than March 30, 2012. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.

DRAFT Feb 9, 2012

Proposed UMCP Policy on Faculty Parental Leave

This policy applies to both full-time and part-time tenured and tenure-track faculty and non-tenure track faculty with appointments for at least 50% FTE and a minimum term of 6 months. To be eligible for parental leave, a faculty member must have been employed with the institution for at least 6 months.

Paid Parental Leave

Eligible faculty are entitled to receive paid Parental Leave of up to 30 workdays (6 work weeks) in connection with the birth of the faculty member's child or placement of a child younger than age 5 with the faculty member for adoption or foster care. Parental leave is available to eligible faculty within the first twelve (12) months following the birth or placement of a child for adoption or foster care. No institutional work-related duties are required of the faculty member by the University while he/she is on paid Parental Leave.

Parental leave is available to both male and female faculty parents. A birth mother also may be eligible to use creditable or non-creditable sick leave in the event of medically documented complications or illnesses related to pregnancy, such as severe morning sickness, the need for prenatal care, childbirth and the recovery from childbirth. Use of creditable or non-creditable sick leave shall not diminish the amount of parental leave to which the faculty parent is entitled. Use of parental leave does not require the faculty member to submit medical documentation.

When both parents have faculty status at the institution, each one shall be entitled to a separate, individual, maximum period of parental leave. The amount of leave for which one parent may be eligible, or the amount of leave used by one parent shall not limit or enhance the leave amount or the leave usage of the other parent. Parents shall be entitled to take leave in succession or simultaneously as long as simultaneous leaves do not substantially disrupt the academic program or unit of which the faculty members are a part.

In order to take advantage of this policy, the faculty member must notify their chair or unit head, and, if applicable, the Dean at least two months in advance of the date of expected use. Notice should include the projected date of birth of the child or the expected date of the child's placement through adoption or foster care.

In the event both eligible parents work at the institution, a period of paid Parental Leave is available to both, on a sequential basis, provided the faculty member on Parental Leave is responsible for more than 50% of the care of the child during normal working hours during that period. Both parents are expected to coordinate leave arrangements so that the combined periods of Parental leave and Modified Duties are not exceeded.

Other policies that may be relevant to faculty pertaining to the birth or adoption of a young child are referenced below:

II-2.30(D) UMCP Policy and Procedures Concerning Adoption Leave for Faculty

<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii230d.html>

II-2.31(A) University of Maryland Policy on Family and Medical Leave for Faculty

<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii231a.html>

II-1.00(D) University of Maryland Policy on Extension of Time for Tenure Review Due to Personal and Professional Circumstances

<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii100d.html>

II-1.10(A) University of Maryland Policy for Part-Time Status of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Due to Childrearing Responsibilities

<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii110a.html>

II-2.30- Policy on Accident Leave and Creditable and Non-Creditable Sick Leave for Faculty Members

<http://www.usmh.usmd.edu/regents/bylaws/SectionII/II230.html>

II-2.30(A) University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for Non-Creditable Sick Leave for Faculty Members

<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii230a.html>

II-2.20(A) UMCP Guidelines and Procedures for Faculty Leave of Absence Without Pay

<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii220a.html>

DRAFT Feb 9, 2012

Proposed UMCP Policy on Modified Duties for New Parents

This policy applies to both full-time and part-time tenured and tenure-track faculty and non-tenure track faculty with appointments for at least 50% FTE and a minimum term of 6 months. To be eligible for parental leave, a faculty member must have been employed with the institution for at least 6 months.

Modified Duties

In addition to paid Parental Leave, eligible faculty parents may request an additional periodic of time during which her/his institutional work duties are reduced or modified without a reduction of salary. A faculty parent is eligible if she/he will be providing more than 50% of the care of the infant or young child during normal institutional working hours during this period. This period of Modified Duties is not leave, but rather a temporary reduction in institutional workload without a reduction in pay, intended to aid the faculty member in adjusting to the demands of parenting a newborn, adopted, or foster care child under the age of five.

Faculty members with instructional responsibilities (including tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track instructors and lecturers) are entitled to a release from classroom teaching duties and service responsibilities for up to one (1) semester. Faculty members with instructional responsibilities are expected to continue to perform other non-classroom instructional duties for which they are ordinarily responsible, such as advising graduate students, as well as to sustain their research/creative activities as applicable during this period. Instructional faculty utilizing modified duty pursuant to this policy shall not be required to make up the reduced classroom teaching load in another semester to offset the reduced classroom course load during the period of modified duties.

Faculty without instructional responsibilities are entitled to a period of Modified Duties of up to 30 work days (6 weeks) in addition to the six (6) weeks of paid Parental Leave, subject to any limits established by contract or grant by the funding agency responsible for a research faculty member's salary support. The exact nature and schedule of the Modified Duties of faculty without instructional responsibilities shall be defined and approved in consultation with the faculty member's chair or unit head.

The period of eligibility for Modified Duties will normally extend from 3 months prior to 12 months following the birth or placement of a child for adoption. The combined period of Parental leave and Modified Duties must be concluded within 12 months of the birth or placement of the child for adoption.

In the event both eligible parents work at the institution, a period of Modified Duties is available to both, on a sequential basis, provided the faculty member on Modified Duties is responsible for more than 50% of the care of the child during normal working hours during that period. Both parents are expected to coordinate leave arrangements so that the combined periods of Parental leave and Modified Duties are not exceeded.

Other policies that may be relevant to faculty pertaining to the birth or adoption of a young child are referenced below:

II-2.30(D) UMCP Policy and Procedures Concerning Adoption Leave for Faculty

<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii230d.html>

II-2.31(A) University of Maryland Policy on Family and Medical Leave for Faculty

<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii231a.html>

II-1.00(D) University of Maryland Policy on Extension of Time for Tenure Review Due to Personal and Professional Circumstances

<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii100d.html>

II-1.10(A) University of Maryland Policy for Part-Time Status of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Due to Childrearing Responsibilities

<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii110a.html>

II-2.30- Policy on Accident Leave and Creditable and Non-Creditable Sick Leave for Faculty Members

<http://www.usmh.usmd.edu/regents/bylaws/SectionII/II230.html>

II-2.30(A) University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for Non-Creditable Sick Leave for Faculty Members

<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii230a.html>

II-2.20(A) UMCP Guidelines and Procedures for Faculty Leave of Absence Without Pay

<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii220a.html>



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	11-12-31
PCC ID #:	N/A
Title:	Proposal to Change the Minimum Average in all Courses Applied to Undergraduate Major Requirements Report
Presenter:	Robert Buchanan, Chair, Senate Academic Procedures and Standards (APAS) Committee
Date of SEC Review:	4/5/2012
Date of Senate Review:	4/19/2012
Voting (highlight one):	1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	<p>With the implementation of plus/minus grading in Fall 2012, minus grades will be accepted in all University-wide policies that currently define requirements as a D, C, B or A grade. A grade of D- will be accepted as the lowest passing grade. According to the Provost's Implementation Plan for plus/minus grading, many academic departments and programs require minimum course grades that do not specify a plus (+) or minus (-). If an academic unit does not wish to accept plus or minus grades in satisfaction of any given requirements, the unit must submit a formal request for an exception to the University-wide Implementation Plan. The intent of the proposal is to create a minimum campus standard for completing undergraduate degree requirements at the University. As a result of implementing such a campus-wide undergraduate minimum standard, many academic units would no longer need to submit degree requirement program proposals changes for their majors in FY13, which would significantly reduce the number of undergraduate program proposals that departmental, college/school, and the Senate Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee would have to review.</p>
Relevant Policy # & URL:	III-7.00(A) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND DEGREE REQUIREMENTS http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/iii700a.html

Recommendation:	<p>The APAS Committee recommends the following addition to University of Maryland College Park Policy III-7.00(1) University of Maryland Degree Requirements (Appendix 1), and asks that the change be implemented prior to July 1, 2012:</p> <p>Section B. 4. "Grade Point Average" in Policy III-7.00(1) University of Maryland Degree Requirements should be edited to include the following statement (Appendix 2):</p> <p>"Beginning with students matriculating in Fall 2012, to be awarded a baccalaureate degree, students must have a minimum C (2.00) cumulative grade point average across all courses used to satisfy major degree requirements. Individual department, college, school, or program requirements may exceed this minimum."</p>
Committee Work:	<p>Throughout its review, the APAS Committee consulted with the proposer, the Office of Undergraduate Studies, and the President's Legal Office for advice. The APAS Committee also reviewed peer institution research, and analyzed data from the Office of the Provost, during its discussions.</p> <p>On Tuesday, March 27, 2012, the APAS Committee drafted and voted to approve a recommendation regarding cumulative grade point average across all courses used to satisfy major degree requirements. The text of the recommendation was then reviewed by the President's Legal Office for appropriateness.</p>
Alternatives:	<p>The Senate could choose not to endorse the committee's recommendation that undergraduate students must have a minimum C (2.00) cumulative grade point average across all courses used to satisfy major degree requirements. The possibility that some undergraduate students could earn the required 2.0 cumulative GPA for graduation, but have less than a 2.0 cumulative GPA in the subset of courses required for their major, would remain.</p>
Risks:	<p>There are no associated risks.</p>
Financial Implications:	<p>There are no related financial implications.</p>
Further Approvals Required: <i>(*Important for PCC Items)</i>	<p>Senate Approval, Presidential Approval</p>

Senate Academic Procedures and Standards (APAS) Committee

Senate Document 11-12-31

Proposal to Change the Minimum Average in all Courses Applied to Undergraduate Major Requirements Report

March 2012

BACKGROUND

At the beginning of the 2010-2011 academic year, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Academic Procedures and Standards (APAS) Committee with reviewing the University of Maryland Policies Concerning Academic Transcript and Calculation of Grade Point (GPA) Average. The SEC asked APAS to make a recommendation concerning whether the University should reconsider its grading system. While the University Senate voted in December 2005 to adopt a weighted plus/minus grading system, and the President approved the policy, implementation of the system was delayed by the Office of the Provost in 2006. After further research and review, the APAS Committee recommended in April 2011 that the Office of the Provost develop an implementation plan for the transition to plus/minus grading.

Following a review of the potential issues related to implementation of plus/minus grading, and an analysis of the potential effects on students, the Office of the Provost developed an implementation plan for plus/minus grading (Appendix 3), as requested by APAS. This plan was endorsed by the APAS Committee in October 2011, and the committee recommended that full implementation of weighted plus/minus grading take place at the beginning of the Fall 2012 semester. The Senate approved this recommendation on November 9, 2011, and the President endorsed the plan on November 21, 2011.

The Provost's Implementation Plan states, "For currently enrolled students, cumulative GPA calculations will include grades granted under both the prior and present grading policy as of the effective date of implementation. University-wide requirements currently in place for a specific letter grade will be converted to accept a minus grade. Following implementation, academic programs may revise the letter grade requirements for specific courses, entry requirements to a program, or courses for graduation, by submitting requests through appropriate processes."

IMPACT ON CURRENT PROCEDURES

With the implementation of plus/minus grading in Fall 2012, minus grades will be accepted in all University-wide policies that currently define requirements as a D, C, B or A grade. A grade of D- will be accepted as the lowest passing grade. According to the Provost's Implementation Plan, many academic departments and programs require minimum course grades that do not specify a plus or minus. If an academic unit does not wish to accept plus or minus grades in satisfaction of any given requirements, the unit must submit a formal request for an exception to the University-wide Implementation Plan.

A memo from the Provost's Office to the Deans in December 2011 explained that changes in requirements approved by the end of the Fall 2012 semester will be effective in Fall 2013. This will allow the review by the Senate PCC Committee to be completed by December 2012, which will provide enough time for the University to give timely notice of the Fall 2013 changes, as well as for changes to be made to the Undergraduate Catalog, etc.

The memo explained that implementation will take place in two phases: 1) By Fall 2012, the Registrar will be prepared to make GPA calculations, and changes in University publications and communications defining minimum required grades will be completed, and 2) By Fall 2013, consideration of proposed changes in degree requirements and course prerequisites submitted by academic units will be completed.

The Provost's memo also explained that a change in required grades (e.g., if a program considers requiring a grade of C rather than a C-) for individual courses in a major constitutes a change in degree requirements. The memo confirmed that, under University policy, any change in degree requirements applies only to newly entering students, with all currently registered majors having the opportunity to complete their degree under existing requirements. All proposals to modify degree requirements should be considered through established University procedures, including review in department and college committees and then by the Senate Program, Curricula, and Courses Committee and, as appropriate, by the Graduate Council and its PCC Committee.

COMMITTEE WORK

On February 24, 2012, the APAS Committee was charged by the SEC with reviewing a new proposal regarding a minimum campus standard for completing undergraduate degree requirements at the University. The APAS Committee met with the proposer, an Associate Dean in the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (BSOS), on February 27, 2012. At the meeting, the proposer explained the rationale behind the proposal and provided a thorough explanation of the current situation. The proposal would require that all undergraduate students earn a minimum course grade of C- in each course used to meet major requirements and a minimum cumulative grade point average (GPA) of 2.0 in all courses used to meet major requirements. The proposed minimum GPA is in addition to the minimum of 2.0 in all courses that students need in order to graduate.

The proposal is the result of recognition that, with the implementation of the policy as approved by the Senate, undergraduate students could earn the required 2.0 for graduation, but have less than a 2.0 in the subset of courses required for their major. This proposal would remedy that situation and it would standardize the requirement across the campus. According to the Provost's Office, a very preliminary review of recent graduates shows that, in fact, no student who recently graduated was in this situation, so passing this legislation would likely not to have a negative impact on undergraduate students.

The committee received input from the Provost's Office during its review, including the suggestion that individual departments should be able to determine what the minimum passing grade will be for courses in their major programs, rather than having a campus-wide requirement of a C- in every required course. The committee agreed, and decided not to recommend that the minimum grade for any required course be set as a C- campus-wide.

The committee discussed this issue at both its February and March 2012 scheduled meetings. The committee also reviewed the following peer institution policy research, as provided by the proposer:

- UCLA: "Students must have an overall GPA of 2.0 in all of their UC coursework, and a 2.0 GPA in the major coursework."
- UC Berkeley: Grade requirements vary by department with most majors requiring a 2.0 cumulative GPA in their major coursework.
- University of Michigan: Grade requirements vary by department with most majors requiring a 2.0 cumulative GPA in their major coursework.
- University of North Carolina: A C (2.0) grade is essentially required in general education, major course work, and major field of study. "To graduate with a baccalaureate degree, students must...attain a final cumulative grade point average of at least 2.0. Students also must satisfy all General Education requirements and complete at least 18 semester hours in the major field with a grade of C or better (C- does not qualify)."
- UNC-Chapel Hill: Students "must complete a major field of student as prescribed by the department or curriculum. Although a specific grade point average in the major is not required, a minimum of 18 hours of C or better (C- does not qualify) in the major is required. Selected majors require 21 hours of C or better grades in the major."
- University of Illinois: Grades of 2.0 for general education and curricular courses are required. "Students must earn a cumulative GPA of 2.00 (C) or better in all courses taken on this campus included in their major GPA." Some departments require a higher cumulative GPA for graduation.

RECOMMENDATION

The APAS Committee endorses the proposer's intent of creating of minimum campus standard for completing undergraduate degree requirements at the University of Maryland College Park. As a result of implementing such a campus-wide undergraduate minimum standard, many academic units should no longer need to submit degree requirement program proposals changes for their majors in FY13, which will significantly reduce the number of undergraduate program proposals that departmental, college/school, and the Senate PCC Committee will have to review.

On Tuesday, March 27, 2012, the APAS Committee drafted and voted to approve a recommendation regarding cumulative grade point average across all courses used to satisfy major degree requirements. The text of the recommendation was then reviewed by the President's Legal Office for appropriateness.

The committee recommends the following addition to University of Maryland College Park Policy III-7.00(1) University of Maryland Degree Requirements (Appendix 1), and asks that the change be implemented prior to July 1, 2012:

Section B. 4. "Grade Point Average" in Policy III-7.00(1) University of Maryland Degree Requirements should be edited to include the following statement (Appendix 2):

Beginning with students matriculating in Fall 2012, to be awarded a baccalaureate degree, students must have a minimum C (2.00) cumulative grade point average across all courses used to satisfy major degree requirements. Individual department, college, school, or program requirements may exceed this minimum.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Current Policy III-7.00(1) University of Maryland Degree Requirements

Appendix 2 – Recommended Change to Policy III-7.00(1) University of Maryland Degree Requirements, in Bold and Blue Font

Appendix 3 – The Provost's Implementation Plan for Plus/Minus Grading, Fall 2011

Appendix 4 - Charge from the Senate Executive Committee, February 24, 2012

Appendix 5 – Proposal from Katherine Pedro Beardsley, February 15, 2012

Appendix 1

III-7.00(A) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT 1 AUGUST 1991;
AMENDED 19 NOVEMBER 2009

A. Policy

General requirements for undergraduate and graduate degree programs at UMCP are outlined below. Requirements for graduation at UMCP vary according to the character of work in the different colleges, schools, departments, and other academic units. It is the responsibility of the colleges, schools, departments, and other academic units to establish and publish clearly defined degree requirements. These requirements must be approved by the President. The responsibility for knowing and meeting all degree requirements for graduation in a particular curriculum rests with the student. Specific degree requirements are listed in the Undergraduate Catalog and University of Maryland at College Park Graduate School Catalog with the description of each program.

B. Undergraduate Degree Requirements

1. Residency Requirement

- a. All candidates for undergraduate degrees from UMCP must take a minimum of 30 credits at UMCP. These must include a minimum of fifteen credits in courses numbered 300 or above, including at least twelve credits in the major field.
- b. Normally these 30 credits will be the final 30 credits counted toward the degree. However, credits from University-approved study abroad and internship programs, and a maximum of 6 credits that are not part of such programs, may be included in the final 30 if approved in advance by the dean of the academic unit from which the student expects to receive the degree.

2. Enrollment in Majors

A student must be enrolled in the major program from which he or she plans to graduate when registering for the final fifteen hours of the baccalaureate program. The requirement applies to the third year of the combined pre-professional degree programs.

3. Credit Requirements

No baccalaureate degree will be awarded in instances where fewer than 120 credits have been earned. Many undergraduate curricula at UMCP require more than 120 credits. It is the responsibility of the student to become familiar with the requirements of particular curricula.

*To earn a baccalaureate degree at UMCP a minimum of thirty credits must be taken in residence.

4. Grade Point Average

A minimum 2.00 grade point average is required for graduation in all curricula. A higher average may be required by the individual department, college, school, or program.

C. Second Degrees and Second Majors

1. Second Degree Taken Sequentially

A student who has completed requirements for, and who has received one baccalaureate degree and who wishes to earn a second baccalaureate degree from UMCP must satisfactorily complete the requirements of the second degree and enough additional credits so that the total including all applicable credits earned at UMCP, or elsewhere is at least 150 credits. In no case will a second baccalaureate degree be awarded to a student who has not completed thirty credits in residence at UMCP. Approval of the second degree will not be granted when there is extensive overlap between the two programs.

2. Second Degree Taken Simultaneously

A student who wishes to receive simultaneously two baccalaureate degrees from UMCP must satisfactorily complete a minimum of 150 credits (180 credits if one of the degrees is in Special Education). The regularly prescribed requirements of both degree programs must be completed. As early as possible, and in any case, no later than one full semester before the expected date of graduation, the student must file with the departments or programs involved, as well as with the appropriate deans, formal programs showing the programs to be offered to meet the major, supporting area, college, and general education program requirements. If two colleges are involved in the double degree program, the student must designate which college is responsible for the maintenance of records. Approval of the second degree will not be granted when there is extensive

overlap between two programs.

3. Second Major

A student who wishes to complete a second major concurrently with a primary major of record must obtain written permission in advance from the appropriate deans. As early as possible, but in no case later than one full semester before the expected date of graduation, the student must file with the department or programs involved and with the appropriate deans, formal programs showing the courses to be offered to meet requirements in each of the majors and supporting areas as well as the college and general education program requirements. Approval will not be granted if there is extensive overlap between the two programs. Courses taken for one major may be counted as part of the degree requirements of the other and toward general education requirements as appropriate. If two colleges are involved in the double major program, the student must designate which college is responsible for the maintenance of records.

D. Graduate School Degree Requirements

1. Requirements Applicable to All Master's Degrees

a. Programs

The entire course of study undertaken for any master's degree must constitute a unified, coherent program which is approved by the student's advisor and graduate director, and which meets Graduate School requirements.

A minimum of thirty semester hours in courses acceptable for credit towards a graduate degree is required (some degree programs require more than thirty credits) ; in certain cases, six of the thirty semester hours must be thesis research credits. The graduate program must include at least twelve hours of course work at the 600 level or higher. If the student is inadequately prepared for the required graduate courses, additional courses may be required, which may not be considered as part of the student's graduate program. With the exception of pre-approved Combined Bachelor's/Master's programs, credits to be applied to a student's graduate program for a master's degree cannot have been used to satisfy any other previously earned degree.

b. Grade Point Average

A student seeking a master's degree at UMCP must maintain an average grade of "B" (3.0) in all courses taken for graduate credit.

c. Time Limitation

All requirements for the master's degree must be completed within a five year period. This time limit applies to any transfer work from other institutions to be included in the student's program.

d. Additional Requirements

In addition to the above requirements, special departmental or collegiate requirements may be imposed, especially for degrees which are offered only in one department, college, or division.

2. Graduate School Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts and Master of Science

a. Thesis Option

Course Requirements- A minimum of thirty semester hours including six hours of thesis research credit is required. A minimum of twelve of the twenty four hours earned in graduate courses must be in the major subject; and a minimum of twelve credits must be selected from courses numbered 600 or above.

Thesis Requirements- A thesis must be submitted for the Master of Arts and Master of Science degrees except for those programs in which a non-thesis option has been approved by the dean in conformity with the policy of the Graduate Council.

Oral Examination- A final oral examination on the thesis shall be held when the student has completed the thesis to the satisfaction of the student's advisor, provided all other requirements for the degree have been completed, and a 3.00 grade point average has been earned.

b. Non-Thesis Option

The quality of work is expected is identical to the thesis program. The general requirements for those in a non-thesis program are a minimum of thirty semester credit hours in courses approved for graduate credit, with a minimum of a grade of "B" in all course work. In addition, there must be a minimum of eighteen credit hours in courses numbered 600 or above, the submission of one or more scholarly papers, and the completion of a comprehensive final examination, a portion of which must be written.

3. Requirements for the Degree of Master of Education

- a. A minimum of thirty semester hours in coursework with a grade average of "B". Grades for courses not a part of the program but taken in graduate status will be computed in the average;
- b. A minimum of fifteen hours in courses numbered 600-800 with the remainder at least in the 400 series;
- c. A comprehensive written examination taken at the end of coursework;
- d. EDMS 645;
- e. EDMS 646 or MUED 690 and one seminar paper, or two seminar papers.

4. Graduate School Requirements Applicable to all Doctoral Degrees

a. Credit Requirements

The Graduate School requires that every student seeking the doctoral degree register for a minimum of twelve research credits, but the number of research and other credit hours required in the program varies with the degree and program in question.

b. Admission to Candidacy

Preliminary examinations, or such other substantial tests as the department may elect, are frequently prerequisite for admission to candidacy.

A student must be admitted to candidacy for the

doctorate within five years after admission to the doctoral program and at least one academic year before the date on which the degree will be confirmed.

c. Time Limitation

The student must complete the entire program for the degree, including the dissertation and final examination, during a four year period after admission to candidacy. Extensions of time are granted only under the most unusual circumstances. If students fail to complete all requirements within the time allotted, they must submit another application for admission to the Graduate School and, if readmitted, another application for Advancement to Candidacy, after satisfying the usual program prerequisites prior to Advancement to Candidacy.

d. Dissertation

A dissertation or its equivalent is required of all candidates for a doctoral degree. The topic of the dissertation must be approved by the department or program committee.

During the preparation of the dissertation, all candidates for any doctoral degree must register for the prescribed number of semester hours of Doctoral Dissertation Research (899) at University of Maryland.

5. Graduate School Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The Doctor of Philosophy is granted only upon sufficient evidence of high attainment in scholarship and the ability to engage in independent research. It is not awarded for the completion of course and seminar requirements no matter how successfully completed. In addition, a number of departments have a foreign language requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree. There is no Graduate School requirement stipulating a specific number of course credits in either a major or minor subject. It is the policy of the Graduate School to encourage the development of individual programs for each student who seeks the Ph.D.

Dissertation

The ability to do independent research must be demonstrated by an original dissertation on a topic approved by the department or program.

6. Graduate School Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

The requirements for the Doctor of Education (Ed.D) degree are for the most part the same as those for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in the College of Education. The Ed.D. requires a minimum of six semester hours of dissertation credit.

Recommended Addition Noted in Blue & Bold Font

III-7.00(A) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT 1 AUGUST 1991;
AMENDED 19 NOVEMBER 2009

A. Policy

General requirements for undergraduate and graduate degree programs at UMCP are outlined below. Requirements for graduation at UMCP vary according to the character of work in the different colleges, schools, departments, and other academic units. It is the responsibility of the colleges, schools, departments, and other academic units to establish and publish clearly defined degree requirements. These requirements must be approved by the President. The responsibility for knowing and meeting all degree requirements for graduation in a particular curriculum rests with the student. Specific degree requirements are listed in the Undergraduate Catalog and University of Maryland at College Park Graduate School Catalog with the description of each program.

B. Undergraduate Degree Requirements

1. Residency Requirement

- a. All candidates for undergraduate degrees from UMCP must take a minimum of 30 credits at UMCP. These must include a minimum of fifteen credits in courses numbered 300 or above, including at least twelve credits in the major field.
- b. Normally these 30 credits will be the final 30 credits counted toward the degree. However, credits from University-approved study abroad and internship programs, and a maximum of 6 credits that are not part of such programs, may be included in the final 30 if approved in advance by the dean of the academic unit from which the student expects to receive the degree.

2. Enrollment in Majors

A student must be enrolled in the major program from which he or she plans to graduate when registering for the final fifteen hours of the baccalaureate program. The requirement applies to the third year of the combined pre-professional degree programs.

3. Credit Requirements

No baccalaureate degree will be awarded in instances where fewer than 120 credits have been earned. Many undergraduate curricula at UMCP require more than 120 credits. It is the responsibility of the student to become familiar with the requirements of particular curricula.

*To earn a baccalaureate degree at UMCP a minimum of thirty credits must be taken in residence.

4. Grade Point Average

A minimum 2.00 grade point average is required for graduation in all curricula. A higher average may be required by the individual department, college, school, or program.

Beginning with students matriculating in Fall 2012, to be awarded a baccalaureate degree, students must have a minimum C (2.00) cumulative grade point average across all courses used to satisfy major degree requirements. Individual department, college, school, or program requirements may exceed this minimum.

C. Second Degrees and Second Majors

1. Second Degree Taken Sequentially

A student who has completed requirements for, and who has received one baccalaureate degree and who wishes to earn a second baccalaureate degree from UMCP must satisfactorily complete the requirements of the second degree and enough additional credits so that the total including all applicable credits earned at UMCP, or elsewhere is at least 150 credits. In no case will a second baccalaureate degree be awarded to a student who has not completed thirty credits in residence at UMCP. Approval of the second degree will not be granted when there is extensive overlap between the two programs.

2. Second Degree Taken Simultaneously

A student who wishes to receive simultaneously two baccalaureate degrees from UMCP must satisfactorily complete a minimum of 150 credits (180 credits if one of the degrees is in Special Education). The regularly prescribed requirements of both degree programs must be completed. As early as possible, and in any case, no

later than one full semester before the expected date of graduation, the student must file with the departments or programs involved, as well as with the appropriate deans, formal programs showing the programs to be offered to meet the major, supporting area, college, and general education program requirements. If two colleges are involved in the double degree program, the student must designate which college is responsible for the maintenance of records. Approval of the second degree will not be granted when there is extensive overlap between two programs.

3. Second Major

A student who wishes to complete a second major concurrently with a primary major of record must obtain written permission in advance from the appropriate deans. As early as possible, but in no case later than one full semester before the expected date of graduation, the student must file with the department or programs involved and with the appropriate deans, formal programs showing the courses to be offered to meet requirements in each of the majors and supporting areas as well as the college and general education program requirements. Approval will not be granted if there is extensive overlap between the two programs. Courses taken for one major may be counted as part of the degree requirements of the other and toward general education requirements as appropriate. If two colleges are involved in the double major program, the student must designate which college is responsible for the maintenance of records.

D. Graduate School Degree Requirements

1. Requirements Applicable to All Master's Degrees

a. Programs

The entire course of study undertaken for any master's degree must constitute a unified, coherent program which is approved by the student's advisor and graduate director, and which meets Graduate School requirements.

A minimum of thirty semester hours in courses acceptable for credit towards a graduate degree is required (some degree programs require more than thirty credits) ; in certain cases, six of the thirty semester hours must be thesis research credits. The graduate program must include at

least twelve hours of course work at the 600 level or higher. If the student is inadequately prepared for the required graduate courses, additional courses may be required, which may not be considered as part of the student's graduate program. With the exception of pre-approved Combined Bachelor's/Master's programs, credits to be applied to a student's graduate program for a master's degree cannot have been used to satisfy any other previously earned degree.

b. Grade Point Average

A student seeking a master's degree at UMCP must maintain an average grade of "B" (3.0) in all courses taken for graduate credit.

c. Time Limitation

All requirements for the master's degree must be completed within a five year period. This time limit applies to any transfer work from other institutions to be included in the student's program.

d. Additional Requirements

In addition to the above requirements, special departmental or collegiate requirements may be imposed, especially for degrees which are offered only in one department, college, or division.

2. Graduate School Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts and Master of Science

a. Thesis Option

Course Requirements- A minimum of thirty semester hours including six hours of thesis research credit is required. A minimum of twelve of the twenty four hours earned in graduate courses must be in the major subject; and a minimum of twelve credits must be selected from courses numbered 600 or above.

Thesis Requirements- A thesis must be submitted for the Master of Arts and Master of Science degrees except for those programs in which a non-thesis option has been approved by the dean in conformity with the policy of the Graduate Council.

Oral Examination- A final oral examination on the thesis shall be held when the student has completed the thesis to the satisfaction of the student's advisor, provided all other requirements for the degree have been completed, and a 3.00 grade point average has been earned.

b. Non-Thesis Option

The quality of work is expected is identical to the thesis program. The general requirements for those in a non-thesis program are a minimum of thirty semester credit hours in courses approved for graduate credit, with a minimum of a grade of "B" in all course work. In addition, there must be a minimum of eighteen credit hours in courses numbered 600 or above, the submission of one or more scholarly papers, and the completion of a comprehensive final examination, a portion of which must be written.

3. Requirements for the Degree of Master of Education

- a. A minimum of thirty semester hours in coursework with a grade average of "B". Grades for courses not a part of the program but taken in graduate status will be computed in the average;
- b. A minimum of fifteen hours in courses numbered 600-800 with the remainder at least in the 400 series;
- c. A comprehensive written examination taken at the end of coursework;
- d. EDMS 645;
- e. EDMS 646 or MUED 690 and one seminar paper, or two seminar papers.

4. Graduate School Requirements Applicable to all Doctoral Degrees

a. Credit Requirements

The Graduate School requires that every student seeking the doctoral degree register for a minimum of twelve research credits, but the number of research and other credit hours required in the program varies with the degree and program in

question.

b. Admission to Candidacy

Preliminary examinations, or such other substantial tests as the department may elect, are frequently prerequisite for admission to candidacy.

A student must be admitted to candidacy for the doctorate within five years after admission to the doctoral program and at least one academic year before the date on which the degree will be confirmed.

c. Time Limitation

The student must complete the entire program for the degree, including the dissertation and final examination, during a four year period after admission to candidacy. Extensions of time are granted only under the most unusual circumstances. If students fail to complete all requirements within the time allotted, they must submit another application for admission to the Graduate School and, if readmitted, another application for Advancement to Candidacy, after satisfying the usual program prerequisites prior to Advancement to Candidacy.

d. Dissertation

A dissertation or its equivalent is required of all candidates for a doctoral degree. The topic of the dissertation must be approved by the department or program committee.

During the preparation of the dissertation, all candidates for any doctoral degree must register for the prescribed number of semester hours of Doctoral Dissertation Research (899) at University of Maryland.

5. Graduate School Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The Doctor of Philosophy is granted only upon sufficient evidence of high attainment in scholarship and the ability to engage in independent research. It is not awarded for the completion of course and seminar requirements no matter how successfully completed. In

addition, a number of departments have a foreign language requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree. There is no Graduate School requirement stipulating a specific number of course credits in either a major or minor subject. It is the policy of the Graduate School to encourage the development of individual programs for each student who seeks the Ph.D.

Dissertation

The ability to do independent research must be demonstrated by an original dissertation on a topic approved by the department or program.

6. Graduate School Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

The requirements for the Doctor of Education (Ed.D) degree are for the most part the same as those for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in the College of Education. The Ed.D. requires a minimum of six semester hours of dissertation credit.

Implementation Plan for Plus/Minus Grading Office of the Provost

Summary and Recommendations

The Senate Executive Committee requested that the Provost provide an implementation plan for plus/minus grading (Report of the Senate Academic Procedures and Standards (APAS) Committee). The plan analyzes effects on students and presents an implementation process.

Impact on Undergraduate Students

Plus/minus grading will result in a very small reduction in cumulative GPA, three one-hundredths of a GPA point (0.03), based on analysis of all freshmen admits and Fall transfer admits in the period 2006-2010 over their first four years of study. There are no substantive differences by race/ethnicity in GPA effects. GPA effects are almost constant across GPA levels. The principal source of a lower GPA arises because A- grades are awarded 3.7 grade points rather than 4.0. The negative effect on cumulative GPA for transfer students is also 0.03.

There is a small increase in the number of students with cumulative GPA below 2.0, approximately 0.5% of first-year students (approximately 20 students in each freshmen cohort). The number of students affected is lower for students who have progressed farther toward their degrees. Race/ethnicity differences in the increase in numbers of students with GPA below 2.0 are relatively small.

Virtually all leading universities now use plus/minus grading that includes C- grades and A+ grades. The APAS proposal awarding 4.0 grade points for an A+ is aligned with other leading public institutions. Awarding 4.3 grade points to A+ grades will reduce (but not eliminate) the small negative effect on cumulative GPAs.

A principal benefit of plus/minus grading is to provide a more accurate representation of student achievement. Associated student incentive effects are not captured in GPA comparisons in the report.

Recommendations for Implementation

1. The University should award 4.0 grade points to an A+ grade in accordance with the APAS report. This will require Senate action to amend the April 26, 2006, policy which included 4.3 grade points for an A+.
2. For currently enrolled students, cumulative GPA calculations will include grades granted under both the prior and present grading policy as of the effective date of implementation.
3. University-wide requirements currently in place for a specific letter grade will be converted to accept a minus grade. Following implementation, academic programs may

revise the letter grade requirements for specific courses, entry requirements to a program, or courses for graduation, by submitting requests through appropriate processes.

4. Senate approval of a new policy by the end of the Fall 2011 term should provide sufficient time to complete other steps for plus/minus grading to begin in Fall 2012. Delays in Senate action or academic program review and modification of course/degree requirements under the new system could delay implementation for another academic year.
5. Implementation of plus/minus grading should include all undergraduate courses. It should also include graduate courses upon the recommendation of the Graduate Council.

Plus/Minus Grading Effects for Undergraduates

I. Senate Proposals for Plus/Minus Grades in Grade Point Average (GPA) Calculations.

The University Senate has twice approved plus/minus grading and its use in GPA calculations. An extensive study of plus/minus grading was conducted in years 1999-2000 by a University task force, including campus-wide discussion and surveys of undergraduate and graduate students and faculty. The proposal was passed by the Senate on April 6, 2000, and approved by President Mote on August 28, 2000. Implementation was deferred. The Senate again approved plus/minus grading on December 25, 2005, with presidential approval on April 26, 2006. Implementation was again deferred.

The Senate Academic Procedures and Standards Committee (APAS) recommendation for plus/minus grading differs from the prior Senate approved policies only by assigning 4.0 grade points for an A+ rather than 4.3 grade points. The APAS proposal is as follows:

Grade	Grade points
A+	4.0
A	4.0
A-	3.7
B+	3.3
B	3.0
B-	2.7
C+	2.3
C	2.0
C-	1.7
D+	1.3
D	1.0
D-	0.7
F	0

In the previous Senate-approved policies and in the APAS proposal, the present marking system defining the standards for letter grades is retained: A+, A, A- denotes excellent mastery of the subject and outstanding scholarship; B+, B, B- denotes good mastery of the subject and good

scholarship; C+, C, C- denotes acceptable mastery of the subject; D+, D, D- denotes borderline understanding of the subject (It denotes marginal performance, and it does not represent satisfactory progress toward a degree.); and F denotes failure to understand the subject and unsatisfactory performance. The marking system should remain unchanged.

II. Grading Policies at Peer Institutions. Virtually all leading (Top 25) major public universities, including our peer institutions, use plus/minus systems, typically adjusting grades 0.3 grade points up or down for plus/minus grades. (See Table 1.) Approximately one-half include the grade of A+, which is awarded 4.0 grade points. While not included in GPA calculations, the award of an A+ provides an additional indicator of excellent performance. Approximately 80% of leading public institutions include a C- grade, with a large fraction awarding 1.7 grade points. Plus/minus grading is also used in the majority of leading private universities, with many including A+ and C- grades. Adoption of the 2011 Senate APAS proposal would align the University's grading system with other major public research institutions.

III. Static and Dynamic Effects on Students. The effect of different policies for translating letter grades into numerical grades and cumulative GPAs can be readily compared by recalculating cumulative GPAs for any proposed policy. Three alternative policies are compared below: the present policy, Senate-approved policy, and the 2011 Senate APAS proposal. The analysis describes changes in GPAs, as well as changes in the number of students who would have a cumulative GPA below a 2.0 GPA.

The overall effect of any grading policy depends on a number of dynamic factors, most notably student reactions to the challenges and opportunities under alternative grading policies. Introduction of plus/minus grading provides additional incentives, since success (as reflected in course grades) is more precisely defined and measured. Plus/minus grading is likely to encourage students at all grade levels to strive for a higher grade. For example, a minus grade could be an insufficient grade to meet a course, department, college, or other university requirement. Simple recalculations of GPAs for a given set of grades under alternative policies do not capture these incentive effects.

IV. GPAs for Students Entering and Completing with a Single Grading Policy. The simplest illustration of GPA effects compares cumulative GPAs for students throughout their period of study under two alternative policies -- the University's existing policy without plus/minus grade points with the proposed policy of plus/minus grading with A and A+ grades given four grade points. Grades awarded for the period Fall 2006-Fall 2010 are used in the analysis. (A comparison of the 2000/2005 Senate policy with 4.3 awarded for A+ appears below.)

- A. **Grade Distributions at the University of Maryland.** Differences in outcomes associated with a plus/minus policy depend on the distribution of plus/minus grades at the University. If many more students receive plus rather than minus grades, calculated cumulative GPA will be increased; alternatively, a preponderance of minus grades will result in a lower cumulative GPA. Individual students will vary in the number of plus or minus grades received.

For the period Fall 2006-Fall 2010 there were more plus grades awarded to undergraduate students than minus grades at letter grades B, C, and D. Hence plus/minus grade points at these grade levels would contribute to a higher cumulative GPA. (See Table 2.) Conversely, at the A level, the proposed policy awards 3.7 points for an A-. The A- grade accounts for 14% of all undergraduate grades in this time period. Regardless whether an A+ is given 4.0 or 4.3 grade points, fewer total grade points would be awarded for grades at the A level, contributing to a lower cumulative GPA. The aggregate effect of plus/minus grading reflects the net effect of these grade patterns.

- B. GPAs for Freshmen Cohorts, Fall 2006-Fall 2010, Over Four Years of Study.** The comparison below calculates cumulative GPA effects for incoming freshmen in five entry cohorts (Fall 2006-Fall 2010) under these two policies. Analysis of cumulative GPA effects is shown by an analysis of cumulative GPAs for incoming freshmen (fall and spring admits) in five cohorts (Fall 2006-Fall 2010) as students conclude subsequent years at the University. GPA effects are shown for students at the end of each of their first four years at the University.

The average change in GPA across all students in these five cohorts at the end of their first year of study is a negative three one-hundredths of a point in GPA (-0.03). Average effects remain at this same level for the cohorts of students who have finished two years, three years, and four years. (See Table 3a.) More students in any given year will have reductions in their GPA than the number whose GPA is increased.

GPA effects of plus/minus grading are virtually identical for students across race/ethnicity categories, with an average GPA decline of -0.03 across cohorts and race/ethnicity categories. (Table 3b.)

Plus/minus grading effects on cumulative GPA for students at all GPA levels exhibit only slight differences by GPA level. Students at higher GPA levels, with GPA above 3.3, have reductions of -0.04 or -0.05. (See Table 4.) This difference likely is traceable to the larger number of A- grades received by students at higher GPA levels.

- C. Number of Students with Cumulative GPA Below 2.0.** The University requires that students must have a 2.0 overall GPA to avoid being placed on probation or being dismissed and to have an overall 2.0 GPA to graduate. Under the plus/minus grading policy, the number of students whose cumulative GPA fell below 2.0 would be slightly increased. The largest increase would occur at the conclusion of year one at the University. For the five freshmen cohorts Fall 2006-Fall 2010, an average of 20 additional students per cohort are estimated to have a cumulative GPA below 2.0, 0.5% of all students finishing their first year, under the plus/minus policy. (See Table 4.)

The additional number of students under plus/minus grading with a cumulative GPA below 2.0 would be lower for students completing their second, third, and fourth years at the University, only 0.3% (ten students per cohort) for students finishing their fourth

year. These calculated differences do not take into account incentive effects or other dynamic effects noted above that could result in fewer students falling below a 2.0 GPA.

There are small differences among students across race/ethnicity categories in the proportion of students whose GPA falls below 2.0 under plus/minus grading. For the period 2006-2009, the proportion of additional students falling below a cumulative GPA of 2.0 for the largest student groups is as follows: Asian, U.S., 0.5%; Black/African American, U.S., 1.0%; Hispanic, U.S., 0.5%; and White, U.S., 0.3%. A 1.0% proportion increase of Black/African American students with a GPA below 2.0 under plus/minus grading is an average of approximately four additional students each year. Sample sizes are insufficient to support meaningful analysis of changes by year of study and cohort year within each student group. These comparisons do not include the most recent entry cohort (Fall 2010) when a new system for coding race/ethnicity was introduced at the University.

- D. Transfer Students.** Plus/minus grading has a similar estimated effect on transfer students. Cumulative GPA effects were examined for fall transfer enrollees for the period Fall 2006-Fall 2010. The average change in GPA across all students in these cohorts at the end of their first year of study is -0.03 and remains at this same level for the cohorts of students who have finished two years, three years, and four years. (See Table 6.)

Plus/minus grading results in approximately 20 additional transfer students having a GPA below 2.0 after their first year, 1.1% of all transfer students. The additional number of transfer students under plus/minus grading with a cumulative GPA below 2.0 would be slightly lower for transfer students who have advanced farther toward their degrees.

V. Comparison of Senate-Approved Policy and APAS 2011 Proposal. Senate-approved policy awarded 4.3 grade points to A+ grades, in comparison to the APAS proposal. Awarding 4.3 grade points to A+ grades increases cumulative GPA only very slightly, by one or two one-hundredths of a point (0.01 or 0.02), with the effect highest for students completing their fourth year. The resultant effect of plus/minus grading on cumulative GPA under the Senate approved policy falls to 0.01 or 0.02 depending on years of study. (See Table 7.)

VI. Effect on Currently Enrolled Students in the Transition. There are two important dimensions in assessing the effect of introducing plus/minus grading policy on currently enrolled students: (1) how cumulative GPA will be calculated, and (2) estimating the magnitude of the change in cumulative GPA.

A student's cumulative GPA will include grade points awarded under the prior and the new policy. The grades and grade points already received by current students under the previous official grade policy will remain unchanged. Current students will receive grade points under the new policy when it becomes effective. The University transcript will include an explanation of this system. A survey of registrars at other institutions showed that this methodology has been used by numerous universities that have introduced plus/minus grades over an extended period of time, and no alternative approach was identified. The most recent major research institutions

that changed grading policy using this methodology are the University of Georgia (2006), Purdue University (2008), and the University of Texas (2009).

The effect of the policy change on cumulative GPAs for current students will depend on how long a student has been at the University. For recently admitted students, cumulative GPA over time will largely reflect grades received under the new policy (a policy they may not have contemplated when they enrolled). For more advanced students, fewer grades will be awarded under the new policy, and effects on cumulative GPA will be smaller. For the average of all undergraduate students currently enrolled, the number of credits receiving plus/minus grades would be approximately one half of the total credits earned at graduation, which implies that the cumulative GPA effect for currently enrolled students would be approximately half the effect presented above for students who are under the new system for four years.

Implementation Process and Timetables

A. Review of Existing Requirements Not Met by a Minus Grade. The implementation plan presented here accepts minus grades in all university-wide policies that now define the requirement as a D, C, B, or A grade. A grade of D- is accepted as the lowest passing grade. Many academic departments and programs require minimum course grades that do not specify a plus or minus. This occurs most often at the course level where minimum course grades are part of a course prerequisite requirement, an entry requirement to a major or program, or a degree requirement. If an academic unit does not wish to accept plus or minus grades in satisfaction of any of these requirements, the unit must submit a formal request for an exception to this university-wide implementation plan.

B. Graduate Courses and Graduate Education. Previous policies approved by the Senate have included graduate courses and programs. The Graduate Council should analyze the impact of the recommended proposal for plus/minus grading on graduate students, courses, and programs, and the Dean of the Graduate School should report findings and recommendations to the Senate. Introducing plus/minus grading by course level at different points in time will significantly increase the administrative costs of making the changes.

C. Timetable.

Provost-Senate Task Force: Complete its review and make recommendations to the Senate. (September 1-September 30)

University Senate action on policy. (September 15-December 15)

Academic programs: Review and submit proposals for letter grade requirements for specific courses, entry requirements, or courses for graduation for Senate PCC review. (January 1-February 28)

PCC review or other review as necessary. (February 15-March 31)

Communicate policy changes to faculty, students, and staff, and modify the forthcoming 2012-2013 Undergraduate Catalog as needed. (March 31 – May 31)

Develop administrative procedures to record grades and compile transcripts, Office of Registrar and OIT. (January 1-May 1)

Schedule Contingencies: It will likely take the Spring 2012 term to review and complete adjustments at the course and program level; communicate to the campus; and develop administrative procedures to produce grades and transcripts. If Senate action is not completed during the Fall term, the risk increases that implementation would have to be deferred until Fall 2013.

Provost's Recommendations for Implementation of Plus/Minus Grading

1. The new scale will include the following grades and grade points:

Grade	Grade points
A+	4.0
A	4.0
A-	3.7
B+	3.3
B	3.0
B-	2.7
C+	2.3
C	2.0
C-	1.7
D+	1.3
D	1.0
D-	0.7
F	0

2. All references in future official University publications requiring minimum grades of (1) D be changed to D minus, (2) C be changed to C minus, (3) B be changed to B minus, and (4) A be changed to A minus. With the adoption of the new grading scale, D minus will be considered the lowest passing grade.
3. Exceptions to this change for individual course requirements, degree requirements, and academic policies must be made by the appropriate academic units through the normal processes. For example, a grade of C might be required, rather than a "C minus" grade in the new plus/minus system, to meet a course prerequisite requirement, one or more course requirements for entry to a major, or to meet degree requirements. This principle applies to required course grades at all levels (C minus, B minus, or A minus).
4. The adoption of this new grading scale will not change requirements that are based on any calculated GPA; examples of GPA requirements include scholastic probation, academic dismissal, graduation, continuation in certain programs, and access to specific courses (based on performance in more than one previous course).
5. The new grading scale will be implemented on a "day forward" basis, being effective on the start of a fall semester (to be specified). This scheduled start date will be adhered to unless the Office of the Registrar states that it cannot ensure that all of the necessary processes are in place to ensure an orderly transition; in that case, it will be begin at the start of the first academic year after such assurance can be made. The new grading system will not be effective until it is described in the Undergraduate Catalog.
6. The new scale will not be valid for grade changes made to a student's record for courses taken before the grading scale became effective.

7. Implementation of plus/minus grading will include all undergraduate courses. It will also include graduate courses upon the recommendation of the Graduate Council.
8. The present marking system defining the standards for letter grades will be retained under the new policy: (A+, A, A- denotes excellent mastery of the subject and outstanding scholarship; B+, B, B- denotes good mastery of the subject and good scholarship; C+, C, C- denotes acceptable mastery of the subject; D+, D, D- denotes borderline understanding of the subject (It denotes marginal performance, and it does not represent satisfactory progress toward a degree.); and F denotes failure to understand the subject and unsatisfactory performance.
9. In accordance with this proposal, the Office of the Registrar will revise the Undergraduate Catalog, the course inventory, the official transcript, and University-level degree audit rules. The Graduate Catalog will be revised as appropriate.

Table 1: Grading Systems at Leading Universities

Public (Ranked 1-25)	University	Highest A Grade		Lowest C Grade	
		Grade	Grade Points	Grade	Grade Points
Peer	University of Illinois	A+	4	C-	1.67
Peer	UNC	A+	4	C-	1.7
Peer	Berkeley	A+	4	C-	1.7
Peer	UCLA	A+	4	C-	1.7
Peer	University of Michigan	A+	4	C-	1.7
	UC San Diego	A+	4	C-	1.7
	Purdue University	A+	4	C-	1.7
	UVA	A+	4	C-	1.7
	University of Pittsburgh	A+	4	C-	1.75
	UC Davis	A+	4	C-	1.7
	UC Santa Barbara	A+	4	C-	1.7
	UC Irvine	A+	4	C-	1.7
	Penn State	A	4	C	2
	Minnesota	A	4	C-	1.67
	University of Washington	A	4	C-	1.85-1.5
	University of Georgia	A	4	C-	1.7
	University of Wisconsin (no +/-)	A	4	C	2
	William and Mary	A	4	C-	1.7
	Georgia Tech	A	4	C	2
	University of Texas-Austin	A	4	C-	1.67
	University of Florida	A	4	C-	1.67
	Ohio State	A	4	C-	1.7
	Texas A&M	A	4	C	2
	Clemson University	A	4	C	2
	Rutgers	A	4	C	2
	University of Connecticut	A	4	C-	1.7
	Virginia Tech	A	4	C-	1.7
Private (Ranked 1-15)					
	Cornell	A+	4.3	C-	1.7
	Columbia	A+	4.3	C-	1.67
	Stanford	A+	4.3	C-	1.7
	University of Pennsylvania	A+	4	C-	1.7
	Duke	A+	4	C-	1.7
	Johns Hopkins	A+	4	C-	1.7
	Washington U at St. Louis	A+	4	C-	1.7
	Princeton	A+	4	C-	1.7
	MIT	A	5	C	3
	University of Chicago	A	4	C-	1.7
	Northwestern	A	4	C-	1.7
	Yale	A	4	C-	1.67
	California Institute of Technology	A+	4.33	C-	1.67
	Dartmouth	A	4	C-	1.67
	Brown (no +/-)	A		C	

***Many Ivy League institutions, including Princeton, Columbia, Brown, and Stanford, do not compute a GPA or maintain a system of class ranking. The above values are the universities' suggestions for converting their grades to grade points, as found on their individual websites. MIT uses plus/minuses for internal purposes only and they do not factor into calculating GPA. Brown does not calculate GPA. University of Wisconsin uses A, AB, B, BC, C, and D rather than pluses and minuses.

Table 2: Full Distribution of Grades Awarded in Fall and Spring Term to Undergraduate Students between Fall 2006 and Fall 2010

Course Grades	N of Grades	% of Total Grades
A+	64,114	6%
A	272,343	25%
A-	148,799	14%
B+	95,409	9%
B	202,504	19%
B-	75,088	7%
C+	38,398	4%
C	95,282	9%
C-	27,309	3%
D+	5,813	1%
D	25,715	2%
D-	4,027	0%
F	29,557	3%
XF	255	0%
Total	1,084,613	100%

Table 3A: Effect on Cumulative GPA for Entering First-Year Students, by Years Completed at the University

Years Completed	Fall Cohorts	Cohort N	N Students with Courses	Avg Effect
Year 1	Fall 2006-2010	20,185	19,761	-0.03
Year 2	Fall 2006-2009	16,262	14,694	-0.03
Year 3	Fall 2006-2008	12,069	9,683	-0.03
Year 4	Fall 2006-2007	8,169	6,438	-0.03

Please Note (for this table and subsequent tables): Only first-time, full-time students were included in the initial fall cohorts. At the end of each year completed, students were included only if they had received a letter grade (e.g. A+ through F) in the given term (e.g. first, second, third, or fourth spring term). The "Avg Effect" displays the average net change in cumulative GPAs at the university level, where students with increasing and decreasing cumulative GPAs may cancel each other out in the overall average. The letter grade values as specified in the recent University Senate Proposal (Document Number 10-11-11) were used in calculating the proposed cumulative GPAs, where an A+ letter grade receives a 4.0.

Table 3B: Effect on Cumulative GPA for Entering First-Year Students, by Years Completed at the University

Years Completed	Race/Ethnicity	Cohort N	N Students with Courses	Avg Effect
Year 1 (Fall Cohorts 2006-2009)	American Indian:U.S.	48	46	-0.02
	Asian:U.S.	2,375	2,349	-0.03
	Black/African-American:U.S.	2,098	2,056	-0.03
	Foreign	261	248	-0.04
	Hispanic:U.S.	1,077	1,044	-0.03
	Unknown:U.S.	765	745	-0.03
	White:U.S.	9,638	9,423	-0.03
Year 2 (Fall Cohorts 2006-2009)	American Indian:U.S.	48	42	-0.02
	Asian:U.S.	2,375	2,223	-0.03
	Black/African-American:U.S.	2,098	1,867	-0.03
	Foreign	261	220	-0.04
	Hispanic:U.S.	1,077	940	-0.03
	Unknown:U.S.	765	690	-0.03
	White:U.S.	9,638	8,712	-0.03
Year 3 (Fall Cohorts 2006-2008)	American Indian:U.S.	41	26	-0.03
	Asian:U.S.	1,708	1,474	-0.03
	Black/African-American:U.S.	1,713	1,402	-0.03
	Foreign	172	132	-0.04
	Hispanic:U.S.	819	629	-0.03
	Unknown:U.S.	595	489	-0.03
	White:U.S.	7,021	5,531	-0.03
Year 4 (Fall Cohorts 2006-2007)	American Indian:U.S.	27	20	-0.03
	Asian:U.S.	1,134	922	-0.03
	Black/African-American:U.S.	1,176	893	-0.03
	Foreign	106	67	-0.04
	Hispanic:U.S.	569	431	-0.03
	Unknown:U.S.	408	317	-0.03
	White:U.S.	4,749	3,788	-0.03

Table 4: Effect of Cumulative GPA for Entering First-Year Students, by Level of Current Cumulative GPA

Current Cumulative GPA Bands	Years Completed							
	Year 1 (Fall Cohorts 2006-2010)		Year 2 (Fall Cohorts 2006-2009)		Year 3 (Fall Cohorts 2006-2008)		Year 4 (Fall Cohorts 2006-2007)	
	N of Students	Avg Effect	N of Students	Avg Effect	N of Students	Avg Effect	N of Students	Avg Effect
0.00-1.99	1,236	-0.02	532	-0.02	233	-0.03	114	-0.03
2.00-2.30	1,091	-0.02	701	-0.02	466	-0.03	271	-0.03
2.31-2.70	2,256	-0.02	1,712	-0.03	1,133	-0.03	649	-0.03
2.71-3.00	2,682	-0.02	2,099	-0.02	1,400	-0.02	909	-0.03
3.01-3.30	3,333	-0.02	2,596	-0.03	1,792	-0.03	1,242	-0.03
3.31-3.70	5,150	-0.03	4,065	-0.04	2,686	-0.04	1,905	-0.04
3.71-4.00	4,013	-0.05	2,989	-0.04	1,973	-0.04	1,348	-0.04
Total	19,761	-0.03	14,694	-0.03	9,683	-0.03	6,438	-0.03

Table 5: Changes in the Number of First-Year Students with a Cumulative GPA Below 2.0, by Years Completed at the University

Years Completed	Fall Entry Cohort	Cohort N	N Students with Courses	Add'l Students LT 2.0 w/ New GPA	
				N	% of Students with Courses
Year 1	Fall 2006	3,945	3,839	24	0.6%
	Fall 2007	4,224	4,132	23	0.6%
	Fall 2008	3,900	3,812	18	0.5%
	Fall 2009	4,193	4,128	17	0.4%
	Fall 2010	3,923	3,850	22	0.6%
	Total	20,185	19,761	104	0.5%
Year 2	Fall 2006	3,945	3,499	16	0.5%
	Fall 2007	4,224	3,795	12	0.3%
	Fall 2008	3,900	3,522	12	0.3%
	Fall 2009	4,193	3,878	12	0.3%
	Total	16,262	14,694	52	0.4%
Year 3	Fall 2006	3,945	3,090	20	0.6%
	Fall 2007	4,224	3,391	15	0.4%
	Fall 2008	3,900	3,202	11	0.3%
	Total	12,069	9,683	46	0.5%
Year 4	Fall 2006	3,945	3,108	10	0.3%
	Fall 2007	4,224	3,330	10	0.3%
	Total	8,169	6,438	20	0.3%

Please Note: Only first-time, full-time students were included in the initial fall cohorts. At the end of each year completed, students were included only if they had received a letter grade (e.g. A+ through F) in the given term (e.g. first, second, third, or fourth spring term). In the "Add'l Students less than 2.0 with New GPA" category, the net effect of the proposed GPA calculation was displayed, which means there were more students with less than a 2.0 cumulative GPA under the proposed calculation method than in the current method. The letter grade values as specified in the recent University Senate Proposal (Document Number 10-11-11) were used in calculating the Proposed cumulative GPAs, where an A+ letter grade receives a 4.0.

Table 6: Changes in the Number of Transfer Students with a Cumulative GPA Below 2.0 and Average Effect to Cumulative GPA, by Years Completed at the University

Years Completed	Fall Entry Cohort	Cohort N	N Students with Courses	Add'l Students LT 2.0 w/ New GPA		Avg Effect
				N	% of Students with Courses	
Year 1	Fall 2006	1,826	1,664	23	1.4%	-0.03
	Fall 2007	1,928	1,737	23	1.3%	-0.03
	Fall 2008	2,038	1,869	22	1.2%	-0.03
	Fall 2009	1,906	1,772	22	1.2%	-0.03
	Fall 2010	1,750	1,622	12	0.7%	-0.03
	Total	9,448	8,664	102	1.2%	-0.03
Year 2	Fall 2006	1,826	1,412	17	1.2%	-0.03
	Fall 2007	1,928	1,463	18	1.2%	-0.03
	Fall 2008	2,038	1,616	16	1.0%	-0.03
	Fall 2009	1,906	1,526	14	0.9%	-0.03
	Total	7,698	6,017	65	1.1%	-0.03
Year 3	Fall 2006	1,826	739	6	0.8%	-0.03
	Fall 2007	1,928	810	4	0.5%	-0.03
	Fall 2008	2,038	876	8	0.9%	-0.03
	Total	5,792	2,425	18	0.7%	-0.03
Year 4	Fall 2006	1,826	165	0	0.0%	-0.03
	Fall 2007	1,928	205	3	1.5%	-0.03
	Total	3,754	370	3	0.8%	-0.03

Please Note: Only full-time new transfer students were included in the initial fall cohorts for their first entry as a transfer student. At the end of each year completed, students were included only if they had received a letter grade (e.g. A+ through F) in the given term (e.g. first, second, third, or fourth spring term). In the "Add'l Students less than 2.0 with New GPA" category, the net effect of the proposed GPA calculation was displayed, which means there were more students with less than a 2.0 cumulative GPA under the proposed calculation method than in the current method. The letter grade values as specified in the recent University Senate Proposal (Document Number 10-11-11) were used in calculating the Proposed cumulative GPAs, where an A+ letter grade receives a 4.0.

Table 7: Effect on Cumulative GPA for Entering First-Year Students Using Different Methods of Accounting for "A+" Letter Grades, by Years Completed at the University

Years Completed	Fall Cohorts	Cohort N	N Students with Courses	Avg Effect	
				Proposed (A+= 4.0)	Approved (A+=4.3)
Year 1	Fall 2006-2010	20,185	19,761	-0.03	-0.01
Year 2	Fall 2006-2009	16,262	14,694	-0.03	-0.01
Year 3	Fall 2006-2008	12,069	9,683	-0.03	-0.01
Year 4	Fall 2006-2007	8,169	6,438	-0.03	-0.02

Please Note: Only first-time, full-time students were included in the initial fall cohorts. At the end of each year completed, students were included only if they had received a letter grade (e.g. A+ through F) in the given term (e.g. first, second, third, or fourth spring term). The "Avg Effect" displays the average net change in cumulative GPAs at the university level, where students with increasing and decreasing cumulative GPAs may cancel each other out in the average. The letter grade values as specified in the recent University Senate Proposal (Document Number 10-11-11) were used in calculating the proposed cumulative GPAs, where an A+ letter grade receives a 4.0. Cumulative GPAs were recalculated under Senate approved grading, where an A+ letter grade receives a 4.3 (Document Number 99-00-56).



University Senate CHARGE

Date:	February 24, 2012
To:	Robert Buchanan Chair, Academic Procedures & Standards
From:	Eric Kasischke Chair, University Senate 
Subject:	Proposal to Change the Minimum Average in all Courses Applied to Undergraduate Major Requirements
Senate Document #:	11-12-31
Deadline:	March 30, 2012

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) requests that the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee review the attached proposal entitled, Proposal to Change the Minimum Average in all Courses Applied to Undergraduate Major Requirements.

The University Senate and President Loh approved the “Proposal to Review the University of Maryland Policies Concerning Academic Transcripts and Calculation of Grade Point Average (Senate Doc. No. 10-11-11)” in November 2011. The Office of the Provost was charged with implementing the recommendations in the legislation. Provost Wylie’s implementation plan instructs units that, “All references in University publications defining minimum required grades must be changed to D-, C-, B-, or A- rather than D, C, B, or A.” Units that would like to make changes to their degree requirements must submit a proposal through the Senate’s PCC Committee, and those changes would not be implemented until the Fall 2013 semester. The attached proposal requests that the University consider an overall requirement of a C (2.0) cumulative grade point average in all courses used to satisfy major degree requirements. The SEC requests that the APAS Committee review the attached proposal and determine whether this requirement is appropriate.

Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Consult with the proposer to discuss her specific concerns about the current implementation plan.
2. Review similar implementation policies for weighted plus/minus grading at our peer institutions.

3. Consult with representatives of the Office of the Provost on the impact of this proposed change on our academic mission.
4. Consult with the University's Office of Legal Affairs.
5. If appropriate, recommend whether an overall change to the minimum grade point average for degree requirements is necessary.

Because the new policy and subsequent implementation will go into effect in the Fall 2012 semester, we ask that you submit your report and recommendations to the Senate Office no later than March 30, 2012. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.



University Senate PROPOSAL FORM

Name:	Katherine Pedro Beardsley
Date:	February 15, 2012
Title of Proposal:	Proposal to Change the Minimum Average in all Courses Applied to Undergraduate Major Requirements
Phone Number:	301-405-1692
Email Address:	kbeard@umd.edu
Campus Address:	2141 Tydings Hall
Unit/Department/College:	College of Behavioral and Social Sciences
Constituency (faculty, staff, undergraduate, graduate):	Staff
Description of issue/concern/policy in question:	<p>In Fall 2012 the campus will implement the Policy on Plus/Minus Grading. The thrust of the policy incorporates fractional computations of numerical values assigned to letter grades in the calculation of students' grade point averages. The implementation of this policy will not allow departments or programs to change their degree requirements until FY13.</p> <p>Currently, the degree requirements of most majors at the University of Maryland use a grade of C (2.0) for courses which fulfill major requirements, as well as supporting area (where applicable) and skills options (where applicable) courses.</p> <p>A letter sent by the Provost's office to Deans regarding implementation of the new policy on calculating grade point averages states:</p> <p>"All references in University publications defining minimum required grades must be changed to D-, C-, B-, or A- rather than D, C, B, or A."</p> <p>The result will be that for the Fall 2012 cohort, a C- will suffice in courses used to meet various types of major requirements. These students could possibly graduate with a 2.0 cumulative grade point average even though earning only a 1.70 (C-) in every course required for the major; higher grades in elective and general education courses could counter-balance low grades within the field where the student is supposed to have developed specialized understanding</p>

and competencies. Although this possible outcome may not occur often, the fact that it is possible indicates a weakening of rigor within majors.

During FY13 there will be a number of program proposals which will be generated to change the minimum degree requirements to a 2.0 average in courses required for the major and/or specific grades for courses required for the major will be proposed. Thus, the Fall 2013 cohort will be under a different set of degree requirements than the cohort of Fall 2012.

This can result in inequities for students, monumental difficulties for advisors, and a more-complicated-than necessary transition to the eventual goal of most academic programs: To have a clear set of standards that define educational expectations for our students.

By way of comparison, here is a listing of the degree requirements of our peer institutions:

At UCLA “students must have an overall GPA of 2.0 in all of their UC coursework, and a 2.0 GPA in the major coursework.” At UC Berkeley and the University of Michigan, grade requirements vary by department with most majors requiring a 2.0 cumulative GPA in their major coursework.

The University of North Carolina essentially requires a C (2.0) grade in general education, major course work and major field of study:

“To graduate with a baccalaureate degree, students must successfully complete at least 120 semester hours of course work and attain a final cumulative grade point average of at least 2.0. Students also must satisfy all General Education requirements and complete at least 18 semester hours in the major field with a grade of C or better (C- does not qualify). In all cases, at least half of the courses and credit hours in the major must be completed at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.”

UNC-Chapel Hill students “must complete a major field of study as prescribed by the department or curriculum. Although a specific grade point average in the major is not required, a minimum of 18 hours of C or better (C- does not qualify) in the major is required. Selected majors require 21 hours of C or better grades in the major. Students transferring credits in their major field must earn a grade of C (not C-) or better in at least three-fourths of those courses and credit hours in the major that are taken at UNC–Chapel Hill. All

	<p>students, including students transferring from another institution, must take at least half of their major course requirements at UNC–Chapel Hill.”</p> <p>At the <u>University of Illinois</u>, grades of 2.0 for general education and curricular courses are required.</p> <p>“College and Combined GPA. Students must earn a cumulative grade-point average of 2.00 (C) or better in all coursework taken on this campus applying to their LAS degree. Students who take off-campus courses must also earn a minimum "combined" GPA of 2.00 (C) or better when transfer grades are averaged with LAS grades. All Secondary Education majors must achieve a minimum 2.50 in these cumulative GPAs.</p> <p>Curricular GPA. Students must meet minimum academic performance standards in their major. Students must earn a cumulative GPA of 2.00 (C) or better in all courses taken on this campus included in their major GPA. Students who take off-campus courses used in their major must also earn a minimum "combined" GPA of 2.00 (C) or better when transfer grades in their major are averaged with LAS grades included in their major GPA. Some departments require a higher cumulative GPA for graduation. All Secondary Education majors must earn a 2.50 GPA in all courses in the major taken on this campus.”</p> <p>To maintain the integrity of our programs, which are comparable to those at peer institutions, we must bring the implementation policy in line with current degree requirements.</p>
<p>Description of action/changes you would like to see implemented and why:</p>	<p>I am recommending that there be a minimum campus standard for completing degree requirements at the University of Maryland. By implementing such a minimum standard it will mean that many academic units across the campus will not have to submit degree requirement program proposal changes to their majors in FY13. This will significantly reduce the number of program proposals that departmental, college/school and campus PCC Committees would have to review.</p> <p>For those academic units who have a degree requirement of a C grade in every course which is a major degree requirement that will automatically change to a C- on July 1, 2012, the following policy is being proposed:</p>

	<p>All students must earn a C (2.0) cumulative grade point average in all courses used to satisfy major degree requirements. The minimum grade for any required course is a C-.</p> <p>Note: Major degree requirements may exceed this minimum requirement as is the case in some academic units across the campus.</p>
Suggestions for how your proposal could be put into practice:	The Campus Senate would pass the grading policy suggested above and direct implementation for Fall 2012.
Additional Information:	

Please send your completed form and any supporting documents to senate-admin@umd.edu or University of Maryland Senate Office, 1100 Marie Mount Hall, College Park, MD 20742-7541. Thank you!



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	08-09-06
Title:	Revisions to the College of Education Plan of Organization
Presenter:	Kenneth Fleischmann, Chair of the Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee
Date of SEC Review:	April 5, 2012
Date of Senate Review:	April 19, 2012
Voting (highlight one):	1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	<p>The University of Maryland Plan of Organization mandates that all Colleges and Schools be governed by a Plan of Organization that conforms to the stipulations set forth in the University of Maryland Plan of Organization, Article 11. College and School Plans of Organization must be reviewed and approved by the University Senate for compliance. The Senate Elections, Representation, and Governance (ERG) Committee is the standing committee responsible for conducting these reviews. The Senate Faculty Affairs Committee is responsible for reviewing the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee section of the Plan and submitting an approved version to the ERG Committee. Any Plan of Organization under review that is determined not to be in compliance with the University of Maryland Plan of Organization, Article 11 is returned to the College or School for revision.</p>
Relevant Policy # & URL:	N/A
Recommendation:	The ERG Committee recommends that the Senate approve the revised College of Education Plan or Organization.
Committee Work:	<p>The College of Education (EDUC) submitted its revised Plan of Organization to the Senate for review on March 3, 2009 (Appendix 1). The ERG and Faculty Affairs Committees reviewed the Plan and returned it to the Dean of the College of Education in March 2009. The suggested revisions were made and the Plan was returned to ERG in June 2009. The ERG Committee reviewed the revised Plan in September 2009. In late September 2009, the College of Education withdrew its Plan from the Senate review process due to an impending reorganization of the College.</p>

	<p>In April 2011 the Senate voted to approve the PCC Proposal to Reorganize and Rename the Departments in the College of Education (Senate Document Number 10-11-41). The President approved the proposal on April 14, 2011. This legislation included a draft Plan of Organization for the newly reorganized College of Education. This new draft Plan of Organization was submitted to the Senate in the Fall of 2011 for review.</p> <p>The Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed the APT section of the newly revised College of Education Plan of Organization at its meeting on September 6, 2011. The Committee found the APT section to be in compliance and voted to approve the APT section of the Plan.</p> <p>The ERG Committee began its review of the College of Education Plan at its September 12, 2011 meeting. The Committee identified areas of concern regarding the organization of the Plan, committee memberships, and hierarchy systems within the Plan. The Committee voted to return the Plan to the College of Education with suggestions and comments. The Committee created a transmittal detailing the Plan's missing elements in addition to providing editorial suggestions. The Committee submitted this documentation to the College of Education and requested a newly revised version of the Plan be made available no later than October 24, 2011.</p> <p>On October 27, 2011 the College of Education returned their revised Plan of Organization to the ERG Committee. The Committee briefly discussed the revisions at its November 7, 2011 meeting and agreed to identify any remaining concerns before the December ERG meeting.</p> <p>At the December 6, 2011 ERG meeting the Committee reviewed all of the committee members' concerns and agreed to edit the suggestions into a checklist format (utilizing the Best Practices in Shared Governance Document from Senate Doc. No. 09-10-49) before returning the Plan to the College of Education for additional review. ERG finalized this checklist and returned the revised Plan and checklist to the College of Education in January 2012.</p> <p>In March 2012 the EDUC Plan was returned to the ERG Committee with edits. The ERG Committee reviewed the revised Plan at its March 28, 2012 meeting and voted unanimously to approve it.</p>
Alternatives:	The updated College of Education (EDUC) Plan of Organization could not be approved and EDUC would be bound by its existing Plan.
Risks:	If not approved, there is a risk that the College of Education (EDUC) Plan of Organization would become out of compliance with the University of Maryland Plan of Organization requirement that the EDUC Plan of Organization be reviewed and approved by the University Senate every ten

	years.
Financial Implications:	None
Further Approvals Required:	Senate Approval, Presidential Approval

Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee
Revisions to the College of Education Plan of Organization
Senate Doc #08-09-06
March 2012

Background

The University of Maryland Plan of Organization mandates that all Colleges and Schools be governed by a Plan of Organization that conforms to the stipulations set forth in the University of Maryland Plan of Organization, Article 11. College and School Plans of Organization must be reviewed and approved by the University Senate for compliance. The Senate Elections, Representation, and Governance (ERG) Committee is the standing committee responsible for conducting these reviews. The Senate Faculty Affairs Committee is responsible for reviewing the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee section of the Plan and submitting an approved version to the ERG Committee. Any Plan of Organization under review that is determined not to be in compliance with the University of Maryland Plan of Organization, Article 11 is returned to the College or School for revision.

Committee Work

The College of Education (EDUC) submitted its revised Plan of Organization to the Senate for review on March 3, 2009 (Appendix 1). The ERG and Faculty Affairs Committees reviewed the Plan and returned it to the Dean of the College of Education in March 2009. The suggested revisions were made and the Plan was returned to ERG in June 2009. The ERG Committee reviewed the revised Plan in September 2009. In late September 2009, the College of Education withdrew its Plan from the Senate review process due to an impending reorganization of the College.

In April 2011 the Senate voted to approve the PCC Proposal to Reorganize and Rename the Departments in the College of Education (Senate Document Number 10-11-41). The President approved the proposal on April 14, 2011. This legislation included a draft Plan of Organization for the newly reorganized College of Education. This new draft Plan of Organization was submitted to the Senate in the Fall of 2011 for review.

The Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed the APT section of the newly revised College of Education Plan of Organization at its meeting on September 6, 2011. The Committee found the APT section to be in compliance and voted to approve the APT section of the Plan.

The ERG Committee began its review of the College of Education Plan at its September 12, 2011 meeting. The Committee identified areas of concern regarding the organization of the Plan, committee memberships, and hierarchy systems within the Plan. The Committee voted to return the Plan to the College of Education with suggestions and comments. The Committee created a transmittal detailing the Plan's missing elements in addition to providing editorial suggestions. The Committee submitted this documentation to the College of Education and

requested a newly revised version of the Plan be made available no later than October 24, 2011.

On October 27, 2011 the College of Education returned their revised Plan of Organization to the ERG Committee. The Committee briefly discussed the revisions at its November 7, 2011 meeting and agreed to identify any remaining concerns before the December ERG meeting.

At the December 6, 2011 ERG meeting the Committee reviewed all of the committee members' concerns and agreed to edit the suggestions into a checklist format (utilizing the Best Practices in Shared Governance Document from Senate Doc. No. 09-10-49) before returning the Plan to the College of Education for additional review. ERG finalized this checklist and returned the revised Plan and checklist to the College of Education in January 2012.

In March 2012 the EDUC Plan was returned to the ERG Committee with edits. The ERG Committee reviewed the revised Plan at its March 28, 2012 meeting and voted unanimously to approve it.

Recommendation

The ERG Committee recommends the Senate approve the revised College of Education Plan of Organization.

Appendices:

Appendix 1: College of Education Plan of Organization Submitted to the Senate in Fall 2011 with Track Changes

Appendix 2: Final Revised College of Education Plan of Organization

Plan of Organization of the College of Education

March 10, 2012

Table of Contents

Purpose of the Plan of Organization	3
Governance	3
Chapter I. The College of Education Assembly	3
Article I. Purpose and Functions	3
Article II. Membership	4
Article III. Officers	5
Article IV. Meetings and Voting on Matters of College Policy and Governance	6
Article V. Parliamentary Authority	7
Chapter II. The College Senate	7
Article I. Purpose and Functions	7
Article II. Membership	7
Article III. Officers	8
Article IV. Meetings	9
Article V. Committees	9
Article VI. Representation in the University Senate	10
Chapter III. College Committees	10
1. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee	11
2. Program, Curriculum, and Course Committee	11
3. Education Preparation Committee	11
4. Undergraduate General Education Committee	12
5. Graduate Education Committee	12
Chapter IV. Administrative Organization	13
Article I. Purpose and Function	13
Article II. Dean and Central Staff	13
Article II. Administrative Units of the College	14
Article IV. Special Administrative Units	15
Chapter V. Staff Organization of the College	15
Chapter VI. Student Organization of the College	15
Chapter VII. Amendments, Reviews, and Revisions	15
Article I. Amendments	15
Article II. Plan of Organization Review	16
Article III. Ratification	16
Article IV. Implementation	16
Chapter VIII. Bylaws	16
Article I. Amendments	16
Chapter IX. Recall and Membership	16
Article I. Recall	16
Article II. Actual Roster of College Committees	17

Mission of the College of Education

The purposes of the College of Education (College hereafter) include: (1) research contributing to the body of knowledge upon which programs of the College are based; (2) instruction in undergraduate, graduate, continuing professional development, and related programs; (3) promoting and facilitating the use of knowledge to improve schools, colleges, and other institutions that enhance learning; and (4) service to the local, state, national, and international educational communities and to the public.

Purpose of the Plan of Organization:

The organization of the College is complex in that it includes an academic organization as well as a management system. The purpose of the present plan is to provide collaborative planning in the systematic decision-making process as it relates to academic decisions and management. Inherent in the purpose is the responsibility for maintaining channels of communication shared by the faculty, staff, and students.

Governance

Central to academic life is meaningful participation of faculty in the process of shared governance by which crucial decisions such as form and content of degree programs; selection and promotion of professors; and conditions affecting work-life relationships are made jointly by faculty and administrators. Shared governance builds on academic standards and academic freedom; it implies consensual decisions, shared accountability, and College ownership of critical decisions.

The governance of the College is fulfilled by the Dean, the College Senate, and four types of committees: (1) The College Standing Committees, which carry out work that calls for faculty involvement in areas linked to programs, courses, and faculty performance. These committees include the APT, a committee with substantial autonomy. (2) The College Senate Standing Committees, which generally deal with the professional environment of the College as well as promote a forward-looking vision. (3) Ad-Hoc Committees of the Senate, which are set up as needed to address specific issues not covered by the other committees. (4) College Administrative Committees, which cover areas and initiatives linked to the overall management of the College.

The functions of all committees, procedures for representation in them, and mechanisms for interaction among them are described in this Plan of Organization and its Bylaws.

CHAPTER I: THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION ASSEMBLY (CEA)

ARTICLE I: Purpose and Functions

Section 1. Purpose

The University of Maryland (UMCP)The CEA provides a means for faculty, staff, and students to: fulfill their responsibilities in carrying out the mission of the College; promote the general welfare; and achieve the highest standards of teaching, research, and service.

Section 2. Functions

The functions of the CEA shall include the following:

- a.) to provide ~~regularly~~ a regular forum for the ~~collective~~ expression of faculty-, staff, and student concerns and viewpoints;
- b.) to provide for full communication among the faculty, staff, and students of the College and the university community;
- c.) to promote collaborative efforts ~~in areas relating to the purpose of~~ within the College ~~of Education;~~
- ~~d. to formulate instruments, policies, and procedures relevant to governance;~~
- e.) ~~d)~~ to act as the referendum body for the College ~~of Education; and~~
- f. ~~to participate in activities relating to the organization and management of the College and its administrative units.~~

ARTICLE II: Membership

The membership of the CEA shall be determined according to the following guidelines: for each constituency:

Section 1: Faculty

Defined as all those employed by the State at the University of Maryland at College Park having the position of tenure track faculty who hold the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor with an appointment of at least 51% in the College of Education, as well as those who have been appointed to full-time positions as Professor of Practice, Research Professor (Assistant, Associate, or Full), Research Scientist, Research Associate, Faculty Research Assistant, Lecturer, or Senior Lecturer in the College of Education. All such persons shall be voting members of the CEA.

Section 2: Staff

Defined as all other employees who are currently appointed and employed by the College ~~of Education~~ for greater than 50% time, and who do not need to be reappointed every year. Also included shall be persons who have been employed greater than 50% time on temporary contractual positions by the College ~~of Education~~ for a continuous period of more than five years. All such eligible members may attend the meetings of the CEA and shall have rights to speak at such meetings. ~~All other persons employed by the College may speak at the CEA meetings. Twelve staff members with voting privileges shall be identified at College wide elections using the Hare system. At most, 2 of these voting members shall be part time (i.e., less than 100%) employees. If the number of faculty in the College changes, the number of staff shall be changed so that the ratio of staff to faculty will round to 1 to 10, with at most 1/6th part-time staff membership. Fifteen elected members of the College staff, with approximate representation to the proportion of exempt and non-exempt staff members in the College have voting privileges in the CEA; the numbers of staff representatives is determined as an apportionment of approximately 10% of the number of faculty members in the CEA.~~

Nominations for staff representatives shall be solicited each spring through an announcement in the College staff listserv, and all eligible staff (as defined above) can participate in this annual election process. The election process should be timed to be completed no later than April 30. Voting for representatives from each of the staff

constituencies above shall be by members of that category only. For purposes of the governance of the College, a person may represent only one category

Section 3: Students

Defined as all undergraduate students enrolled full time in a program of the College ~~of Education~~ and all graduate students enrolled at least 50% of full time in a program of the ~~College of Education~~, as identified no later than April 15th each spring on a list generated from the Dean's office. All such members may attend the meetings of the CEA and shall have the right to speak at such meetings. Students with voting privileges shall be identified at elections: Three graduate students shall be elected from each department to be voting members of the CEA; nine undergraduate students shall be elected by undergraduates in at-large elections (using the Hare system) to be voting members of the CEA. Elections shall be conducted so that each department having an undergraduate program shall have at least two representatives. ~~These~~The numbers of ~~students will have been selected~~student representatives is proportional to represent approximately 10% of the number of faculty members in the CEA ~~apportioned at approximately 5% undergraduate and 5% graduate. If the number of faculty in the college changes, the number of students will be changed so that the ratio of students to faculty will be an even number that rounds to 1 (students) to 10 (faculty), with 1/2 being undergraduates and 1/2 being graduate students.~~

~~Elections specified in this Plan~~Nominations for student representatives to the CEA will be solicited through the College Undergraduate and Graduate Student Associations. Elections shall take place in the spring of each year, timed to be completed no later than April 30. Voting for representatives from each of the undergraduate and graduate constituencies above shall be by members of that categoryconstituency only. For purposes of the Governancegovernance of the College, a person may be inrepresent only one category. ~~The term of service shall begin May 1st.~~

ARTICLE III: Officers

Section 1. Designations

The officers of the CEA shall consist of a Chair, a Chair-elect, and a Secretary. ~~These officers also shall hold the respective positions of Chair, Chair-elect, and Secretary of the College of Education Senate.~~

The position of Chair-elect shall be selected from the membership of the faculty of the CEA, by the voting members of the AssemblyCEA. This person will serve as Chair-elect for one year and as Chair of the CEA for the subsequent year. The election of Chair-elect by the CEA membership shall be held in the spring of each year. Procedures and supervision of nominations and elections shall be established and maintained by the College of Education Senate.CEA. The election for Chair-elect will require a simple majority vote of those voting which, if not attained by any one candidate, will require a run-off election between the two candidates receiving the largest number of votes (See Article V). ~~see Article V~~). The Secretary is elected by members of the Senate (see Article V, Section 1).

~~The position of Secretary shall be selected from the membership of the College of Education Senate. This election shall be held annually at the first meeting of the College of Education Senate scheduled for this purpose following the spring election of Chair-elect and delegates to the College of Education Senate but prior to the last regular monthly meeting of the~~

~~College of Education Senate in May. Only delegates who are newly elected or continuing may vote at the special meeting and all such delegates must have been informed at least one week in advance of its time and place. The meeting shall be chaired by the incoming Chair. The term of office shall begin immediately.~~

Section 2. Vacancies

In the event of vacancies in the offices of Chair, and Chair-elect, ~~or Secretary,~~ the College of Education SenateCEA shall hold a special election at its first meeting following the notice of vacancy.

Section 3. Duties

- a) ~~The~~ Chair shall preside at all meetings of the College of Education SenateCEA and shall perform such other duties as prescribed in the Plan of Organization or assigned by the College of Education SenateCEA.
- b) ~~The~~ Chair-elect shall assist the Chair and preside at meetings of the Assembly ~~and College of Education Senate~~CEA in the absence of the Chair.
- c) ~~The~~ Secretary shall be responsible for minutes of all meetings of the CEA and the College of Education Senate and, with assistance of the Dean's office, maintain the permanent records of the College of Education Assembly and the College of Education Senate, ~~inform the faculty, staff, and students of actions of the College of Education Senate and/or Assembly, validate the roster of the CEA by department or area prior to each meeting of the Assembly, and revalidate the roster in the spring semester in preparation for election of department delegates and delegates at large to the College of Education Senate. The Secretary shall also be responsible for determining the list of those members of the College of Education eligible to vote and to serve.~~CEA.
- d) Officers shall perform the duties ~~prescribed in the parliamentary authority in addition to those outlined in the~~this Plan of Organization and those assigned by the CEA ~~and/or College of Education Senate.~~ Officers are permitted to vote on all matters before the Senate and the CEA.
- e) ~~Vacating~~ officers shall deliver to their successors all official material not later than ten days following election of their successors.

ARTICLE IV: Meetings and Voting on Matters of College Policy and Governance

Section 1. Semi-Annual Meetings

Semi-annual meetings of the CEA shall be held during the Fall~~fall~~ and Spring ~~Semesters~~spring semesters on dates set by the Steering CommitteeChair of the CEA. The agenda for these meetings shall be distributed to the faculty, staff, and students at least one week prior to the meetings. Semi-annual meetings of the CEA shall be open.

Section 2. Special Meetings

Twenty percent of the voting members of the CEA may petition the College Senate for a special meeting of the AssemblyCEA. The petitioners shall present with their petition a proposed agenda for the meeting, which shall be the only order of business at the meeting. Announcements of the time and place and of the agenda shall be made at least two weeks in advance. All special meetings shall be open. A special CEA meeting may also be called by a majority vote of the College of Education Senate with an announcement of the agenda and time and place published two weeks prior to the special meeting. Exception to the

notice requirement shall be made only in an emergency, as determined by the Chair, for which a minimum three-hour notice shall be given stating time, place, and purpose.

Section 3. Voting on Official College Matters

When a ~~COE~~College matter arises that requires a vote of the ~~College Assembly~~CEA, the matter for consideration must be presented at a ~~College Assembly~~CEA meeting (either one of the regular Fall or Spring ~~Assembly~~CEA meetings or a specially-called meeting as described above). After the meeting, an electronic vote shall be taken by members of the ~~College Assembly~~CEA. In order for a vote to stand, at least a quorum must participate in the voting process and at least ~~of a~~ majority of those who vote must approve the proposed measure (a quorum is defined as 50% or more of the ~~Assembly~~CEA members with voting privileges).

ARTICLE V: Parliamentary Authority

Section 4. Speaking at Meetings

Any member of the CEA shall have the right to be recognized and to speak at meetings of the CEA, subject to the rules of order. Individuals who are not members of the CEA and who are introduced by a member of the CEA may be recognized and speak absent the objection of a member of the CEA. In the event of an objection, the chair shall call for an immediate vote on the objection by show of hands, with a simple majority of those eligible to vote and voting prevailing.

ARTICLE V. Parliamentary Authority

The most current version of Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised shall govern the CEA in all cases in which they are applicable and in which they are not in conflict with ~~the~~this Plan of Organization.-

CHAPTER II: THE COLLEGE SENATE

ARTICLE I. Purpose:— and Functions

The purpose of the College ~~of Education~~ Senate is to take action on behalf of the faculty, staff, and students in all matters pertaining to governance within the College in fulfilling its stated responsibilities.

ARTICLE I: Delegates

The College Senate is the executive body of ~~Education~~the CEA for carrying out the governance functions of the College on a regular basis. These functions include:

- a) provide advice with regard to College policy, including academic matters, budget development, resource allocation, and funding priorities;
- b) establish standing and ad hoc committees to carry out responsibilities as needed;
- c) receive and act upon reports of committees;
- d) report its actions, policy proposals, and recommendations to the CEA;
- e) communicate faculty, staff, and student points of view;
- f) receive, consider, and refer appeals and grievances;

- g) review and approve department plans of organization;
- h) perform other functions as approved by the CEA;
- i) advise the Dean on membership to committees that he/she establishes; and
- j) communicate with the University Senate on College Senate issues.

ARTICLE II. Membership

The membership of the College Senate consists of ~~delegates~~ selected senators from the CEA as specified below: following constituencies:

Section 1: Faculty

Each department ~~will~~ shall be served by three representative faculty members, elected in staggered terms. ~~In addition, there will~~ shall be two at-large faculty ~~delegates~~ senators, plus the offices of Chair and Chair-elect.

The faculty of each department shall elect ~~delegates~~ senators to the ~~College of Education~~ Senate each year to replace ~~delegates~~ senators whose terms are expiring. The term of office shall be for two calendar years, beginning with the meeting of the ~~College of Education~~ Senate scheduled annually in the Springspring, elected for two-year staggered terms. When a member is unable to attend meetings for a prolonged period (e.g., leave of absence, sabbatical, prolonged illness), the department may recommend the appointment for a specified time period of a substitute with voting privileges. Only departments with a plan of organization that is approved or pending approval by the ~~College of Education~~ Senate shall have departmental representation.

~~Delegates~~ Senators-at-large shall be elected by the ~~Assembly~~ CEA in the Springspring of each year, following procedures for nomination and election. Procedures and supervision should be established and maintained by the ~~College of Education~~ Senate; the Hare System shall be used to obviate run-offs. The term of office shall be for one calendar year, beginning with the meeting of the ~~College of Education~~ Senate scheduled annually in the Spring for election of the Secretary and Steering Committee members of the ~~CEA-College~~ Senate. At-large ~~delegates~~ senators may be re-elected for successive terms. When an at-large member is unable to attend meetings for a prolonged period, the ~~College of Education~~ Senate Steering Committee shall designate, for a specific time period, a substitute with voting privileges. An election shall be held during this period.

University Senators from the College will serve as ex-officio members of the College Senate, without a vote.

Section 2: Staff

Two exempt persons and one non-exempt person elected at large. ~~The staff delegates shall serve for 2 years, elected in alternate years. exempt and non-exempt staff members will be elected to be approximately proportional to their number in the College. The staff senators shall serve for two years, elected in staggered terms. Nominations for staff senators to the College Senate are elicited each spring through an Announcement in the College staff listserv, and all eligible staff can participate in this annual election process. The election process should take place in the spring of each year and be completed no later than April 30. Voting for representatives from each of the staff constituencies above shall be by~~

members of that category only. For purposes of the governance of the College, a person may represent only one category.

Section 3: Students

One doctoral student, one master's student, and one undergraduate student elected at large ~~by~~ by each respective category of student by doctoral and masters students who are enrolled at least 50% of full time (as defined by the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies) and undergraduate students who are enrolled full time (as defined by the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies) in a program of the College ~~of Education~~. The student ~~delegates~~ senators shall serve for ~~one~~ year, and may stand for reelection only once. ~~University Senators from Nominations for student senators to the College of Education Senate will serve as ex-officio~~ be solicited through the College Undergraduate and Graduate Student Associations. Elections shall take place in the spring of each year and should be completed no later than April 30. Voting for representatives from each of the student categories shall be by members of the COE Senate, without that constituency only. For purposes of the governance of the College, a vote. ~~person may represent only one category.~~

ARTICLE II. Functions.

~~The CEA entrusts to the College of Education Senate responsibility to:~~

~~interpret~~ Section 4. Speaking and implement Voting

All members of the Senate shall have the purposes right to be recognized and functions of the Assembly; to speak and to vote according to the rules of order. Persons who are not members of the Senate may be recognized following introduction by a member of the Senate, provided that no Senator objects. If there be an objection, the Chair shall immediately call for a vote and the majority of members present and voting shall prevail.

- ~~a. provide advice with regard to College policy, including academic matters, budget development, resource allocation, and funding priorities;~~
- ~~b. establish standing and ad hoc committees to carry out responsibilities as needed;~~
- ~~c. receive and act upon reports of committees;~~
- ~~d. report its actions, policy proposals, and recommendations to the Assembly;~~
- ~~e. communicate faculty, staff, and student points of view;~~
- ~~f. identify and approve agenda items;~~
- ~~g. receive, consider, and refer appeals and grievances;~~
- ~~h. review and approve department plans of organization;~~
- ~~i. perform other functions as approved by the Assembly; and~~
- ~~j. advise the Dean on membership to committees that he/she establishes) communicate with the University Senate on College Senate issues.~~

~~ARTICLE III.~~ ARTICLE III. Officers

The officers of the CEA and the officers of the College Senate are the same. The Chair of the CEA is the chair of the College Senate; the Chair-elect of the CEA is the Chair-elect of the College Senate; the Secretary of the CEA is the Secretary of the College Senate.

ARTICLE IV. Meetings

Regular meetings of the College of Education Senate shall be held during the Academic Year. Date, time, and place shall be decided upon by a majority of the membership. A quorum shall consist of a majority of its members. Meetings shall be open to all voting members of the CEA.

~~ARTICLE IV.~~ V. Committees

Section 1: Senate Steering Committee

Purpose: The purpose of the full Senate Steering Committee is to propose the agenda for meetings of the College ~~of Education~~ Senate and the ~~Assembly~~ CEA, to direct the business of the ~~body~~ Senate to appropriate committees and through administrative channels of the College and University, and to advise and assist the Chair in carrying out responsibilities of the CEA and College ~~of Education~~ Senate. The Senate Steering Committee functions as a committee on committees, and makes recommendations concerning committee membership to appropriate individuals or governing bodies. Agenda items may come from within the Senate Steering Committee, from the Dean, or from other interested parties. The Senate Steering Committee shall constitute a Faculty Advisory Committee to provide advice to the Dean and other administrators of the College, Campus, and System where appropriate.

Membership: The Committee shall be composed of the Chair, Chair-elect, and ~~secretary~~ Secretary of the College Senate, a staff representative, a student representative, and three ~~additional~~ faculty members—~~one~~. The faculty members are elected by each their own department. One student member and one staff member of the Senate Steering Committee are elected by the Senate members representing their respective constituencies. In addition to these offices, the College Senate elects a Secretary from among its serving senators for a one-year term members. Fifty percent of the Steering Committee constitutes a quorum. The Committee shall be chaired by the College Senate Chair.

Section 2: Nominating Committee

Purpose: the nominating committee facilitates the annual election of the Chair-elect of the CEA and Senate and the two at-large faculty delegates ~~senators~~ to the College Senate, as well as the College-at-Large faculty representatives ~~large senators~~ to the University Senate. In addition, this committee coordinates with the college ~~College~~ College and departmental administration, the ~~college~~ College and departmental staff, and leaders in the undergraduate and graduate student organizations to ensure that staff and student voting representatives to the CEA and ~~delegates to~~ Senators of the College Senate are selected annually.

Membership: The Chair of the Nominating ~~committee~~Committee is the ~~retired~~immediately outgoing Chair of the College Senate, or ~~their~~his/her approved ~~Designee~~designee, and the current Chair of the College Senate serves as an ex-officio member.– One ~~Senate delegate~~College senator from each department as well as one staff member, one undergraduate, and one graduate student representative shall be ~~appointed~~elected by the Senate ~~Chair~~to serve on the ~~committee~~Committee.

Section 3. Standing and Ad-Hoc Committees of the College Senate

The College ~~of Education~~ Senate is authorized to establish standing and ad-hoc committees to conduct significant college business, which is aimed at enriching the whole college community, and to carry out the responsibilities entrusted to them by the CEA. The Chair of the ~~Senate will appoint one delegate to the~~ College Senate shall appoint one College Senator as the Chair of each Standing Committee, and ensure that the selected Chairs ~~will be~~are formally approved by the College Senate, and that the functions carried out by each committee ~~will be~~are executed by the representative members of the ~~College Assembly~~CEA who are selected annually.– The purpose, procedures, and status of a standing Senate or ad-hoc Senate committee shall be established with each committee's creation. The documents specifying such establishment shall be circulated to the voting members of the full CEA. Specific procedures to establish or to eliminate standing Senate as well as ad-hoc committees may be specified in the Bylaws of the College. A full description of Senate standing and ad-hoc committees, as well as the guidelines for each committee's operations, is detailed in the ~~COE~~College Bylaws.

ARTICLE ~~V: College At-Large~~ VI. Representation in the University Senate ~~Members~~

Section 1: Eligibility

All persons who are faculty members of the CEA, as specified in ~~ART. Chapter I, Article II~~, shall be eligible to be elected as ~~College at-Large~~University Senators. Two faculty members ~~of the University Senate. At large~~per department will be elected to serve a three-year term. Faculty Senators serve a three-year term. All undergraduates enrolled full time in a degree program in the College and all graduate students enrolled at least 50% time are eligible to serve as delegates to the University Senate. Student representatives to the University Senate serve a three-year term, as designated for one year. Staff members in the College who are employed for greater than 50% time and who do not need to be reappointed every year are also eligible to serve. Student and staff representatives are elected through university-wide elections. Student and staff representatives in the University Senate “shared governance” guidelines serve for a one-year term.

Section 2: Nominations and Elections

In any year in which a College at-Large ~~faculty representatives~~senator to the University Senate is to be elected, the Chair of the Nominating Committee shall issue a call for nominations. ~~Nominations may come from any faculty member of the CEA; however, the nominator must obtain the written consent of the nominee. If the number of nominations exceeds the number of vacancies, an election shall be held by secret ballot that will be sent electronically to the university email address of all faculty members of the College. The Nominating Committee of the College Senate shall serve as judge of the election and shall certify results to the University Senate to each department.~~

~~Vacancies~~ Recommendations to fill vacancies in any term of office of a ~~College-at-large representative~~ Senator to the University Senate shall be made ~~by~~ through the ~~Chair~~ faculty members of ~~the College Senate with the advice and consent of the College Senate~~ their respective departments.

~~One at-large undergraduate delegate~~ to the University Senate ~~Executive Committee~~ is selected each spring through a general election process of students. Graduate student and staff delegates from the College to the University Senate are selected at-large from across the University through an annual, campus-wide election process each spring.

CHAPTER III. COLLEGE COMMITTEES

Standing committees of the College serve important functions for the whole college and its membership, and are guided by campus policies. These committees are required to be faculty led and are expected to conduct their work with autonomy. These committees are expected to formulate and present recommendations to the Dean and to the College Administration; they are required to prepare annual reports which are presented to the College Senate and Assembly. Two CEA. Five such committees are currently recognized:

1. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (APT)

Purpose: As specified in the Campus Policies and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure, the ~~COE~~ College APT functions as the second-level review of all faculty recommendations for promotion and tenure presented by departments. The APT is an independent standing committee that formulates and presents recommendations directly to the Dean. (The ~~regular~~ first-level review of tenured faculty, as mandated by campus policy, is separate and occurs at the departmental level in consultation with the Dean's Office.) For a detailed set of criteria and instructions regarding faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure, refer to the University APT Handbook for the current academic year.

Membership: The Committee is composed of two full professors per department, elected by their respective department faculties for staggered two-year terms, and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs serving as an ex-officio, non-voting member. The chair of the APT is chosen by its own members.

2. Program, Curriculum, and Course Committee (PCC)

Purpose: The PCC reviews and ~~sets~~ makes decisions on all proposals concerning new and modified undergraduate and graduate programs, curricula, and courses. ~~In addition, the PCC attends to whether the instructional needs of the college are being met and provides recommendations for curricular improvements across the~~ compliance with University of Maryland at College Park policies. PCC decisions are forwarded to the Dean's office, which in turn presents these decisions to the ~~vice president's advisory committee~~ Vice-President's Advisory Committee (VPAC) and/or other appropriate University committees— (e.g., Senate PCC, Graduate Council, etc.).

Membership: The PCC is composed of two ~~tenured or~~ tenure-line track faculty members from each department, elected by their departments for staggered two-year terms. The Associate Dean for ~~Academic Programs~~ Research and Graduate Education and the Assistant Dean for ~~Assessment~~, Administration, and Planning, and Assessment serve as

ex-officio members with voting privileges. The PCC ~~chair~~Chair is chosen by ~~its own~~the committee members; the PCC ~~chair~~Chair must be an associate or full professor.

While the PCC serves an important role in ensuring that all new and revised programs and courses proposed across the College are technically aligned with the requirements of campus, the work of promoting the on-going quality and overseeing the development of new program areas across the three departments in the College rests with the three specialized college-wide curriculum committees: the Educator Preparation Committee (EPC), the Undergraduate General Education Committee (UGEC), and the Graduate Education Committee (GEC).

3. Educator Preparation Committee (EPC)

Purpose: The EPC oversees the quality and promotes the development of all educator certification program, curricula, and course policies for the College. It also recommends revisions to existing programs, curricula, and courses to promote compliance with accreditation guidelines and acts as a policy-setting body for all educator preparation programs in the Professional Preparation Unit,¹ as is required for NCATE accreditation. The EPC sends its course and program recommendations to the Senate for final consent. As appropriate, recommendations regarding education preparation policy are presented to the Dean and the Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Outreach. The EPC Chair meets each semester with the Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Outreach and the Assistant Dean for Administration, Planning, and Assessment to determine the agenda for Faculty Program Leader and PDS Coordinators meetings in the Professional Education Unit.

Membership: EPC consists of one faculty member from each certification program area, including representatives from Music, Physical Education, and School Library Media, elected by their departments for staggered two-year terms. The Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Outreach and the Assistant Dean for Administration, Planning, and Assessment serve as ex-officio members with voting privileges. The EPC also includes two student representatives (one undergraduate and one graduate) elected for a one-year term by the respective undergraduate and graduate student associations. The EPC Chair is selected by the committee members.

4. Undergraduate General Education Committee (UGEC)

Purpose: The UGE monitors and encourages development of all undergraduate general education program, curricula, and course policies for the College; it also monitors new course proposals and recommends revisions to existing programs, curriculum, and courses. The UGEC sends its course and program recommendations to the Senate for final consent. As appropriate, recommendations regarding education preparation policy are also presented to the Dean and the Associate Dean for General Education Programs.

Membership: The UGEC consists of one faculty member from each department, elected by their departments for staggered two-year terms. The UGEC also includes one undergraduate student representative elected for a one-year term by the undergraduate student association. The Associate Dean for General Education Programs and the

¹ The Professional Education Unit includes all programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals to work in P-12 settings. In addition to the educator preparation programs in the College of Education, the Unit also includes the School Library Media program (College of Information Studies) and the teacher preparation program in Physical Education (School of Public Health), Music (College of Arts and Humanities), and Agriculture (College of Agriculture and Natural Resources).

Assistant Dean for Administration, Planning, and Assessment serve as ex-officio members with voting privileges. The UGEC Chair is selected by the committee members.

5. Graduate Education Committee (GEC)

Purpose: Graduate education in the College is a joint function and responsibility of the College and its Departments. The Graduate Committee has as its primary responsibility coordinating and monitoring the quality and integrity of graduate programs housed in the College's Departments; it also recommends revisions to existing programs, curriculum, and courses to promote compliance with Middle States accreditation guidelines. The GEC sends its course and program recommendations to the Senate for final consent. As appropriate, recommendations regarding education preparation policy are also presented to the Dean and the Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education.

Membership: GEC consists of a tenure-track faculty member who serves as the graduate director from each Department or a faculty member with similar responsibilities, or where a Department has a committee responsible for graduate studies, a member of that committee who is selected by their departments for staggered two-year terms. The Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education, the Associate Director for Graduate Studies, and the Assistant Dean for Administration, Planning, and Assessment serve as ex-officio members with voting privileges. The GEC also includes one graduate student representative elected for a one-year term by the graduate student association. The GEC Chair is selected by the members and must be an associate or full professor.

CHAPTER IV: ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

ARTICLE I: Purpose and Functions

The College Administration shall provide leadership, supervision, and coordination of all educational programs. Its functions shall include, but not be limited to, providing leadership in:

- a) the identification of social, economic, and political trends which have relevance for the mission of the college;
- b) the development of innovative and/or experimental programs of education;
- c) the pursuit and conduct of excellent scholarly research;
- d) the facilitation of excellence in teaching and other academic pursuits of faculty, staff, and students;
- e) the development of effective educational service to the University, State, and profession; and
- ~~f)~~ the improvement of the quality of education and human services in the State of Maryland, the nation, and internationally.

ARTICLE II: Dean and Central Staff

Section 1. Designations

The chief administrator of the College is the Dean, who shall have central staff composed of Associate and Assistant Deans, assistants to the Dean, and authorized support personnel.

Section 2. Appointments

Recommendations for the appointment of the Dean shall be made by an ad hoc search and screening committee. The committee size and composition shall be determined by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The College Senate shall encourage the Provost to insure that a majority of committee members shall be tenure-track faculty members from the College ~~of Education~~ elected by the faculty of the College Senate. All tenure-track faculty members in the College shall be eligible for such election, providing that the composition of the committee does not include more than one faculty member from the same department.

Assistants to the Dean and all supporting personnel shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the appropriate administrative officer, e.g., the Dean, Associate Dean, or Assistant Dean.

Section 3. Consultation with the College Senate

The Dean shall meet with the College Senate on a regular basis in an effort to secure advice with regard to policy and practice of the College. The Dean may request that the Senate Steering Committee place on the agenda of the College Senate such items as are seen fit. The Senate Steering Committee shall make every effort to grant such requests.

ARTICLE III: Administrative Units of the College

Section 1. Scope and Mission of Department

A department of the College shall consist of a group of faculty members with common or closely related disciplinary or mission-oriented interests. All faculty members or groups of faculty offering courses and programs in the College shall be members of at least one department. The immediate government of the department is vested in its departmental faculty, staff, and students as specified by the Plan of Organization of that department, which has jurisdiction over the interests of the department, including authority to determine all questions of departmental educational policy. Actions and policies which affect more than one department are subject to review and approval by the College ~~of Education~~ Senate.

Section 2. Department Membership

All faculty who are eligible to be voting members of the CEA shall have the right to vote and participate in their respective departmental meetings. The department Plan of Organization shall specify which and under what conditions student and staff members shall enjoy the rights of participation and voting in departmental meetings.

Section 3. Department Administration

The chief administrative office of a department is the Chair, whose appointment shall be recommended to the Dean by a search committee composed of and elected by the department faculty, plus two faculty members from other departments of the College appointed by the College ~~of Education~~ Senate. The Chairs of the departments of the College shall meet with the Dean, the Chair of the CEA, and whomever else the Dean specifies. This group shall follow an agenda as set by the Dean, in consultation with its members. Regular minutes of these meetings shall be published.

Each department shall have an appropriate committee structure that represents all members of the department. The membership and method of selection of committees shall be

determined by each department with the stipulation that faculty, as defined by the faculty membership for the ~~College Assembly~~CEA, shall constitute a voting majority of that determinative body. A committee specified in the Plan of Organization of the Department shall advise the Chair in the general administration of departmental affairs and shall also have at least a majority of faculty.

Each department Plan of Organization and its actual implementation shall be reviewed by the College ~~of Education~~ Senate to ensure appropriate participation in departmental matters every 5 years, or sooner if so requested by 25% of any of the faculty, staff, or students who are members of the department.

Section 4. Grievances

Grievances concerning conditions of personal and/or professional welfare within departments shall be handled in accordance with a set of procedures applicable to all departments as established by the College ~~of Education~~ Senate. In the absence of special procedures, the College shall conform with those established by the University Senate or other relevant bodies of the Campus.

ARTICLE IV. Special Administrative Units

Organizations in the College other than Departments shall be known as Special Administrative Units. They shall serve specific purposes established by the Dean with advice of the College ~~of Education~~ Senate.

CHAPTER V. STAFF ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE

Function:

Staff ~~concerns~~ will be channeled through the College Staff- Committee, whose function is to review existing college-wide policies regarding staff issues, such as workload, personnel, morale, hiring practices, equity considerations, and staff development. While the College Staff Committee does not have an administrative oversight function, on occasion it may have access to administrative data in order to evaluate current policy or make proposals for policy change.

Membership:

The College Staff Committee ~~shall include both exempt and non-exempt staff and will be comprised~~ composed of two staff members from each of the departments and four at-large staff members, who work in offices of the College not associated with ~~at least one from the dean's administrative staff, selected from their own constituency~~ a specific department. The Assistant Dean for Assessment, Administration, and Planning will serve ex-officio on the committee. One staff ~~delegate to~~ Senator from the College Senate will be appointed and serve as a Senate liaison and voting member of the College Staff Committee.

CHAPTER VI. STUDENT ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE

Responsibility for creating a student organization for each department rests with the students and faculty of that department. Responsibility for creating an all-College student organization rests with the departmental student organizations. Aspects of student participation shall be established at an appropriate time after the creation of the student organization. Students are invited to communicate directly with the CEA, Senate, and committees that may be specified in the Bylaws.

CHAPTER VII. AMENDMENTS, REVIEWS, AND REVISIONS

ARTICLE I: Amendments

Amendments to the Plan of Organization may be proposed at any meeting of the CEA or College Senate during the academic year. Upon approval of the amendment by a majority of those eligible to vote and voting, any proposed amendment shall be submitted by mail to all members of the CEA eligible to vote within ten class days. An affirmative vote within two weeks of mailing by two-thirds of those voting shall constitute adoption.

ARTICLE II: Plan of Organization Review

This Plan of Organization, accompanying Bylaws and Plans of the departments shall be reviewed at least every fifth year by an ad hoc committee appointed by the College ~~of Education~~ Senate. The first such review is to occur five years from the date of adoption of the Plan by the College ~~of Education~~.

ARTICLE III: ~~Revision~~

~~The requirements for adopting a revision of the Plan of Organization shall be as specified in Chapter V, Article I. Adopting a revision to the Bylaws shall be the same as described in Chapter VI, Article I.~~

ARTICLE IV: Ratification

Adoption of a new Plan shall go into effect in the Spring following ratification. All procedures specified in the newly adopted Plan and Bylaws shall be in force. This includes, for example, elections to take place in accordance with the new rules as approved.

ARTICLE ~~V~~:IV. Implementation

Implementation of the new Plan and Bylaws shall be facilitated by the College Senate Steering Committee ~~of the Senate~~ and those additional persons invited by the Senate Steering Committee to assist.

CHAPTER ~~VI~~:VIII. BYLAWS

The CEA shall have the power to organize its constituents and to make bylaws and regulations for its own proceedings so long as those bylaws do not contravene the statutes of the University, the Powers of the Board of Regents, the powers delegated to the Chancellor and to the President, and this Plan of Organization.

ARTICLE I. Amendments

Amendments to the ~~CEA's~~College Bylaws shall be presented in writing to the College Senate members ten working days in advance of any regular meeting and shall require approval by a majority vote of the members of the College Senate present and voting.

CHAPTER IX: RECALL ~~and~~AND MEMBERSHIP

ARTICLE I. Recall

~~Officers of the CEA and other elected or appointed persons covered by this Plan of Organization are subject to recall by the body which elected or appointed them.~~

A petition bearing the signatures of 20% of the members of the Assembly eligible to vote (as certified by the Secretary) to recall the Chair or Chair-Elect of the Assembly may be introduced by any member of the Assembly at any regularly scheduled or special meeting of the Assembly (see Chapter I, Article IV, Sections 1 and 2). A petition so introduced will require the Senate to schedule a special electronic vote within 14 days (see Chapter I, Article IV, Section 3) in which the officers shall be recalled by a simple majority vote of those members of the Assembly eligible to vote.

Officers or appointees of the Senate may be recalled by the Senate at any regular or special meeting of the Senate; any member of the Senate may introduce a motion to recall an officer or appointee. A simple majority of those present and eligible to vote shall be required for a recall.

ARTICLE II. Annual Roster of College Committees

At the outset of each school year, a list of persons serving on the College Senate and College Senate Committees ~~and the Senate~~ (in addition to other College committees) is to be made available to faculty, staff, and students throughout the College. Faculty, staff, and students should consult their department Chair, unit director, or the Dean's office for a copy of the current membership list. Responsibility for preparation of this list is held by the College Senate Chair ~~of the CEA~~ in cooperation with the Dean's office.

Plan of Organization of the College of Education

March 10, 2012

Table of Contents

Purpose of the College of Education	3
Purpose of the Plan of Organization	3
Governance	3
Chapter I. The College of Education Assembly	3
Article I. Purpose and Functions	3
Article II. Membership	4
Article III. Officers	5
Article IV. Meetings and Voting on Matters of College Policy and Governance	6
Article V. Parliamentary Authority	7
Chapter II. The College Senate	7
Article I. Purpose and Functions	7
Article II. Membership	7
Article III. Officers	8
Article IV. Meetings	9
Article V. Committees	9
Article VI. Representation in the University Senate	10
Chapter III. College Committees	10
1. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee	11
2. Program, Curriculum, and Course Committee	11
3. Education Preparation Committee	11
4. Undergraduate General Education Committee	12
5. Graduate Education Committee	12
Chapter IV. Administrative Organization	13
Article I. Purpose and Function	13
Article II. Dean and Central Staff	13
Article II. Administrative Units of the College	14
Article IV. Special Administrative Units	15
Chapter V. Staff Organization of the College	15
Chapter VI. Student Organization of the College	15
Chapter VII. Amendments, Reviews, and Revisions	15
Article I. Amendments	15
Article II. Plan of Organization Review	16
Article III. Ratification	16
Article IV. Implementation	16
Chapter VIII. Bylaws	16
Article I. Amendments	16
Chapter IX. Recall and Membership	16
Article I. Recall	16
Article II. Actual Roster of College Committees	17

Mission of the College of Education

The purposes of the College of Education (College hereafter) include: (1) research contributing to the body of knowledge upon which programs of the College are based; (2) instruction in undergraduate, graduate, continuing professional development, and related programs; (3) promoting and facilitating the use of knowledge to improve schools, colleges, and other institutions that enhance learning; and (4) service to the local, state, national, and international educational communities and to the public.

Purpose of the Plan of Organization

The organization of the College is complex in that it includes an academic organization as well as a management system. The purpose of the present plan is to provide collaborative planning in the systematic decision-making process as it relates to academic decisions and management. Inherent in the purpose is the responsibility for maintaining channels of communication shared by the faculty, staff, and students.

Governance

Central to academic life is meaningful participation of faculty in the process of shared governance by which crucial decisions such as form and content of degree programs; selection and promotion of professors; and conditions affecting work-life relationships are made jointly by faculty and administrators. Shared governance builds on academic standards and academic freedom; it implies consensual decisions, shared accountability, and College ownership of critical decisions.

The governance of the College is fulfilled by the Dean, the College Senate, and four types of committees: (1) The College Standing Committees, which carry out work that calls for faculty involvement in areas linked to programs, courses, and faculty performance. These committees include the APT, a committee with substantial autonomy. (2) The College Senate Standing Committees, which generally deal with the professional environment of the College as well as promote a forward-looking vision. (3) Ad-Hoc Committees of the Senate, which are set up as needed to address specific issues not covered by the other committees. (4) College Administrative Committees, which cover areas and initiatives linked to the overall management of the College.

The functions of all committees, procedures for representation in them, and mechanisms for interaction among them are described in this Plan of Organization and its Bylaws.

CHAPTER I. THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION ASSEMBLY (CEA)

ARTICLE I. Purpose and Functions

Section 1. Purpose

The CEA provides a means for faculty, staff, and students to: fulfill their responsibilities in carrying out the mission of the College; promote the general welfare; and achieve the highest standards of teaching, research, and service.

Section 2. Functions

The functions of the CEA shall include the following:

- a) to provide a regular forum for the expression of faculty, staff, and student concerns and viewpoints;
- b) to provide for full communication among the faculty, staff, and students of the College and the university community;
- c) to promote collaborative efforts within the College; and
- d) to act as the referendum body for the College

ARTICLE II. Membership

The membership of the CEA shall be determined according to the following guidelines for each constituency:

Section 1. Faculty

Defined as all those employed by the State at the University of Maryland at College Park having the position of tenure track faculty who hold the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor with an appointment of at least 51% in the College of Education, as well as those who have been appointed to full-time positions as Professor of Practice, Research Professor (Assistant, Associate, or Full), Research Scientist, Research Associate, Faculty Research Assistant, Lecturer, or Senior Lecturer in the College of Education. All such persons shall be voting members of the CEA.

Section 2. Staff

Defined as all other employees who are currently appointed and employed by the College for greater than 50% time, and who do not need to be reappointed every year. Also included shall be persons who have been employed greater than 50% time on temporary contractual positions by the College for a continuous period of more than five years. All such eligible members may attend the meetings of the CEA and shall have rights to speak at such meetings. Fifteen elected members of the College staff, with approximate representation to the proportion of exempt and non-exempt staff members in the College have voting privileges in the CEA; the numbers of staff representatives is determined as an apportionment of approximately 10% of the number of faculty members in the CEA.

Nominations for staff representatives shall be solicited each spring through an announcement in the College staff listserv, and all eligible staff (as defined above) can participate in this annual election process. The election process should be timed to be completed no later than April 30. Voting for representatives from each of the staff constituencies above shall be by members of that category only. For purposes of the governance of the College, a person may represent only one category.

Section 3. Students

Defined as all undergraduate students enrolled full time in a program of the College and all graduate students enrolled at least 50% of full time in a program of the College, as identified no later than April 15th each spring on a list generated from the Dean's office. All such members may attend the meetings of the CEA and shall have the right to speak at such meetings. Students with voting privileges shall be identified at elections: Three graduate students shall be elected from each department to be voting members of the CEA; nine undergraduate students shall be elected by undergraduates in at-large elections (using the Hare system) to be voting members of the CEA. Elections shall be conducted so that

each department having an undergraduate program shall have at least two representatives. The numbers of student representatives is proportional to represent approximately 10% of the number of faculty members in the CEA.

Nominations for student representatives to the CEA will be solicited through the College Undergraduate and Graduate Student Associations. Elections shall take place in the spring of each year, timed to be completed no later than April 30. Voting for representatives from each of the undergraduate and graduate constituencies shall be by members of that constituency only. For purposes of the governance of the College, a person may represent only one category.

ARTICLE III. Officers

Section 1. Designations

The officers of the CEA shall consist of a Chair, a Chair-elect, and a Secretary.

The position of Chair-elect shall be selected from the membership of the faculty of the CEA, by the voting members of the CEA. This person will serve as Chair-elect for one year and as Chair of the CEA for the subsequent year. The election of Chair-elect by the CEA membership shall be held in the spring of each year. Procedures and supervision of nominations and elections shall be established and maintained by the CEA. The election for Chair-elect will require a simple majority vote of those voting which, if not attained by any one candidate, will require a run-off election between the two candidates receiving the largest number of votes (see Article V). The Secretary is elected by members of the Senate (see Article V, Section 1).

Section 2. Vacancies

In the event of vacancies in the offices of Chair and Chair-elect, the CEA shall hold a special election at its first meeting following the notice of vacancy.

Section 3. Duties

- a) The Chair shall preside at all meetings of the CEA and shall perform such other duties as prescribed in the Plan of Organization or assigned by the CEA.
- b) The Chair-elect shall assist the Chair and preside at meetings of the CEA in the absence of the Chair.
- c) The Secretary shall be responsible for minutes of all meetings of the CEA and the Senate and, with assistance of the Dean's office, maintain the permanent records of the CEA.
- d) Officers shall perform the duties outlined in this Plan of Organization and those assigned by the CEA. Officers are permitted to vote on all matters before the CEA.
- e) Vacating officers shall deliver to their successors all official material not later than ten days following election of their successors.

ARTICLE IV. Meetings and Voting on Matters of College Policy and Governance

Section 1. Semi-Annual Meetings

Semi-annual meetings of the CEA shall be held during the fall and spring semesters on dates set by the Chair of the CEA. The agenda for these meetings shall be distributed to the faculty, staff, and students at least one week prior to the meetings. Semi-annual meetings of the CEA shall be open.

Section 2. Special Meetings

Twenty percent of the voting members of the CEA may petition the College Senate for a special meeting of the CEA. The petitioners shall present with their petition a proposed agenda for the meeting, which shall be the only order of business at the meeting. Announcements of the time and place and of the agenda shall be made at least two weeks in advance. All special meetings shall be open. A special CEA meeting may also be called by a majority vote of the College Senate with an announcement of the agenda and time and place published two weeks prior to the special meeting. Exception to the notice requirement shall be made only in an emergency, as determined by the Chair, for which a minimum three-hour notice shall be given stating time, place, and purpose.

Section 3. Voting on Official College Matters

When a College matter arises that requires a vote of the CEA, the matter for consideration must be presented at a CEA meeting (either one of the regular Fall or Spring CEA meetings or a specially-called meeting as described above). After the meeting, an electronic vote shall be taken by members of the CEA. In order for a vote to stand, at least a quorum must participate in the voting process and at least a majority of those who vote must approve the proposed measure (a quorum is defined as 50% or more of the CEA members with voting privileges).

Section 4. Speaking at Meetings

Any member of the CEA shall have the right to be recognized and to speak at meetings of the CEA, subject to the rules of order. Individuals who are not members of the CEA and who are introduced by a member of the CEA may be recognized and speak absent the objection of a member of the CEA. In the event of an objection, the chair shall call for an immediate vote on the objection by show of hands, with a simple majority of those eligible to vote and voting prevailing.

ARTICLE V. Parliamentary Authority

The most current version of Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised shall govern the CEA in all cases in which they are applicable and in which they are not in conflict with this Plan of Organization.

CHAPTER II. THE COLLEGE SENATE

ARTICLE I. Purpose and Functions

The purpose of the College Senate is to take action on behalf of the faculty, staff, and students in all matters pertaining to governance within the College in fulfilling its stated responsibilities.

The College Senate is the executive body of the CEA for carrying out the governance functions of the College on a regular basis. These functions include:

- a) provide advice with regard to College policy, including academic matters, budget development, resource allocation, and funding priorities;

- b) establish standing and ad hoc committees to carry out responsibilities as needed;
- c) receive and act upon reports of committees;
- d) report its actions, policy proposals, and recommendations to the CEA;
- e) communicate faculty, staff, and student points of view;
- f) receive, consider, and refer appeals and grievances;
- g) review and approve department plans of organization;
- h) perform other functions as approved by the CEA;
- i) advise the Dean on membership to committees that he/she establishes; and
- j) communicate with the University Senate on College Senate issues.

ARTICLE II. Membership

The membership of the College Senate consists of elected senators from the following constituencies:

Section 1. Faculty

Each department shall be served by three representative faculty members, elected in staggered terms. In addition, there shall be two at-large faculty senators, plus the offices of Chair and Chair-elect.

The faculty of each department shall elect senators to the College Senate each year to replace senators whose terms are expiring. The term of office shall be for two calendar years, beginning with the meeting of the College Senate scheduled annually in the spring, elected for two-year staggered terms. When a member is unable to attend meetings for a prolonged period (e.g., leave of absence, sabbatical, prolonged illness), the department may recommend the appointment for a specified time period of a substitute with voting privileges. Only departments with a plan of organization that is approved or pending approval by the College Senate shall have departmental representation.

Senators-at-large shall be elected by the CEA in the spring of each year, following procedures for nomination and election. Procedures and supervision should be established and maintained by the College Senate; the Hare System shall be used to obviate run-offs. The term of office shall be for one calendar year, beginning with the meeting of the College Senate scheduled annually in the Spring for election of the Secretary and Steering Committee members of the College Senate. At-large senators may be re-elected for successive terms. When an at-large member is unable to attend meetings for a prolonged period, the College Senate Steering Committee shall designate, for a specific time period, a substitute with voting privileges. An election shall be held during this period.

University Senators from the College will serve as ex-officio members of the College Senate, without a vote.

Section 2. Staff

Two exempt persons and one non-exempt person elected at large. The exempt and non-exempt staff members will be elected to be approximately proportional to their number in the College. The staff senators shall serve for two years, elected in staggered terms. Nominations for staff senators to the College Senate are elicited each spring through an Announcement in the College staff listserv, and all eligible staff can participate in this annual election process. The election process should take place in the spring of each year and be completed no later than April 30. Voting for representatives from each of the staff constituencies above shall be by members of that category only. For purposes of the governance of the College, a person may represent only one category.

Section 3. Students

One doctoral student, one master's student, and one undergraduate student elected at large by each respective category of student by doctoral and masters students who are enrolled at least 50% of full time (as defined by the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies) and undergraduate students who are enrolled full time (as defined by the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies) in a program of the College. The student senators shall serve for one year, and may stand for reelection only once. Nominations for student senators to the College Senate will be solicited through the College Undergraduate and Graduate Student Associations. Elections shall take place in the spring of each year and should be completed no later than April 30. Voting for representatives from each of the student categories shall be by members of that constituency only. For purposes of the governance of the College, a person may represent only one category.

Section 4. Speaking and Voting

All members of the Senate shall have the right to be recognized and to speak and to vote according to the rules of order. Persons who are not members of the Senate may be recognized following introduction by a member of the Senate, provided that no Senator objects. If there be an objection, the Chair shall immediately call for a vote and the majority of members present and voting shall prevail.

ARTICLE III. Officers

The officers of the CEA and the officers of the College Senate are the same. The Chair of the CEA is the chair of the College Senate; the Chair-elect of the CEA is the Chair-elect of the College Senate; the Secretary of the CEA is the Secretary of the College Senate.

ARTICLE IV. Meetings

Regular meetings of the College of Education Senate shall be held during the Academic Year. Date, time, and place shall be decided upon by a majority of the membership. A quorum shall consist of a majority of its members. Meetings shall be open to all voting members of the CEA.

ARTICLE V. Committees

Section 1. Senate Steering Committee

Purpose: The purpose of the full Senate Steering Committee is to propose the agenda for meetings of the College Senate and the CEA, to direct the business of the Senate to appropriate committees and through administrative channels of the College and University, and to advise and assist the Chair in carrying out responsibilities of the CEA and College Senate. The Senate Steering Committee functions as a committee on committees, and makes recommendations concerning committee membership to appropriate individuals or governing bodies. Agenda items may come from within the Senate Steering Committee, from the Dean, or from other interested parties. The Senate Steering Committee shall constitute a Faculty Advisory Committee to provide advice to the Dean and other administrators of the College, Campus, and System where appropriate.

Membership: The Committee shall be composed of the Chair, Chair-elect, and Secretary of the College Senate, a staff representative, a student representative, and three faculty members. The faculty members are elected by their own department. One student member and one staff member of the Senate Steering Committee are elected by the Senate members representing their respective constituencies. In addition to these offices, the College Senate elects a Secretary from among its members. Fifty percent of the Steering Committee constitutes a quorum. The Committee shall be chaired by the College Senate Chair.

Section 2. Nominating Committee

Purpose: the nominating committee facilitates the annual election of the Chair-elect of the CEA and Senate and the two at-large faculty senators to the College Senate, as well as the at-large senators to the University Senate. In addition, this committee coordinates with the College and departmental administration, the College and departmental staff, and leaders in the undergraduate and graduate student organizations to ensure that staff and student voting representatives to the CEA and Senators of the College Senate are selected annually.

Membership: The Chair of the Nominating Committee is the immediately outgoing Chair of the College Senate, or his/her approved designee, and the current Chair of the College Senate serves as an ex-officio member. One College senator from each department as well as one staff member, one undergraduate, and one graduate student representative shall be elected by the Senate to serve on the Committee.

Section 3. Standing and Ad-Hoc Committees of the College Senate

The College Senate is authorized to establish standing and ad-hoc committees to conduct significant college business, which is aimed at enriching the whole college community, and to carry out the responsibilities entrusted to them by the CEA. The Chair of the College Senate shall appoint one College Senator as the Chair of each Standing Committee and ensure that the selected Chairs are formally approved by the College Senate and that the functions carried out by each committee are executed by the representative members of the CEA who are selected annually. The purpose, procedures, and status of a standing Senate or ad-hoc Senate committee shall be established with each committee's creation. The documents specifying such establishment shall be circulated to the voting members of the full CEA. Specific procedures to establish or to eliminate standing Senate as well as ad-hoc committees may be specified in the Bylaws of the College. A full description of Senate standing and ad-hoc committees, as well as the guidelines for each committee's operations, is detailed in the College Bylaws.

ARTICLE VI. Representation in the University Senate

Section 1. Eligibility

All persons who are faculty members of the CEA, as specified in Chapter I, Article II, shall be eligible to be elected as University Senators.

Two faculty members per department will be elected to serve a three-year term. Faculty Senators serve a three-year term. All undergraduates enrolled full time in a degree program in the College and all graduate students enrolled at least 50% time are eligible to serve as delegates to the University Senate. Student representatives to the University Senate serve for one year. Staff members in the College who are employed for greater than 50% time and who do not need to be reappointed every year are also eligible to serve. Student and

staff representatives are elected through university-wide elections. Student and staff representatives in the University Senate serve for a one-year term.

Section 2. Nominations and Elections

In any year in which a College at-Large senator to the University Senate is to be elected, the Chair of the Nominating Committee shall issue a call for nominations to each department.

Recommendations to fill vacancies in any term of office of a Senator to the University Senate shall be made through the faculty members of their respective departments.

One at-large undergraduate delegate to the University Senate is selected each spring through a general election process of students. Graduate student and staff delegates from the College to the University Senate are selected at-large from across the University through an annual, campus-wide election process each spring.

CHAPTER III. COLLEGE COMMITTEES

Standing committees of the College serve important functions for the whole college and its membership, and are guided by campus policies. These committees are required to be faculty-led and are expected to conduct their work with autonomy. These committees are expected to formulate and present recommendations to the Dean and to the College Administration; they are required to prepare annual reports which are presented to the College Senate and CEA. Five such committees are currently recognized:

1. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (APT)

Purpose: As specified in the Campus Policies and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure, the College APT functions as the second-level review of all faculty recommendations for promotion and tenure presented by departments. The APT is an independent standing committee that formulates and presents recommendations directly to the Dean. (The first-level review of tenured faculty, as mandated by campus policy, is separate and occurs at the departmental level in consultation with the Dean's Office.) For a detailed set of criteria and instructions regarding faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure, refer to the University APT Handbook for the current academic year.

Membership: The Committee is composed of two full professors per department, elected by their respective department faculties for staggered two-year terms, and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs serving as an ex-officio, non-voting member. The chair of the APT is chosen by its own members.

2. Program, Curriculum, and Course Committee (PCC)

Purpose: The PCC reviews and makes decisions on all proposals concerning new and modified undergraduate and graduate programs, curricula, and courses for compliance with University of Maryland at College Park policies. PCC decisions are forwarded to the Dean's office, which in turn presents these decisions to the Vice-President's Advisory Committee (VPAC) and/or other appropriate University committees (e.g., Senate PCC, Graduate Council, etc.).

Membership: The PCC is composed of two tenured or tenure-track faculty members from each department, elected by their departments for staggered two-year terms. The Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education and the Assistant Dean for Administration, Planning, and Assessment serve as ex-officio members with voting

privileges. The PCC Chair is chosen by the committee members; the PCC Chair must be an associate or full professor.

While the PCC serves an important role in ensuring that all new and revised programs and courses proposed across the College are technically aligned with the requirements of campus, the work of promoting the on-going quality and overseeing the development of new program areas across the three departments in the College rests with the three specialized college-wide curriculum committees: the Educator Preparation Committee (EPC), the Undergraduate General Education Committee (UGEC), and the Graduate Education Committee (GEC).

3. Educator Preparation Committee (EPC)

Purpose: The EPC oversees the quality and promotes the development of all educator certification program, curricula, and course policies for the College. It also recommends revisions to existing programs, curricula, and courses to promote compliance with accreditation guidelines and acts as a policy-setting body for all educator preparation programs in the Professional Preparation Unit,¹ as is required for NCATE accreditation. The EPC sends its course and program recommendations to the Senate for final consent. As appropriate, recommendations regarding education preparation policy are presented to the Dean and the Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Outreach. The EPC Chair meets each semester with the Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Outreach and the Assistant Dean for Administration, Planning, and Assessment to determine the agenda for Faculty Program Leader and PDS Coordinators meetings in the Professional Education Unit.

Membership: EPC consists of one faculty member from each certification program area, including representatives from Music, Physical Education, and School Library Media, elected by their departments for staggered two-year terms. The Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Outreach and the Assistant Dean for Administration, Planning, and Assessment serve as ex-officio members with voting privileges. The EPC also includes two student representatives (one undergraduate and one graduate) elected for a one-year term by the respective undergraduate and graduate student associations. The EPC Chair is selected by the committee members.

4. Undergraduate General Education Committee (UGEC)

Purpose: The UGE monitors and encourages development of all undergraduate general education program, curricula, and course policies for the College; it also monitors new course proposals and recommends revisions to existing programs, curriculum, and courses. The UGEC sends its course and program recommendations to the Senate for final consent. As appropriate, recommendations regarding education preparation policy are also presented to the Dean and the Associate Dean for General Education Programs.

¹ The Professional Education Unit includes all programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals to work in P-12 settings. In addition to the educator preparation programs in the College of Education, the Unit also includes the School Library Media program (College of Information Studies) and the teacher preparation program in Physical Education (School of Public Health), Music (College of Arts and Humanities), and Agriculture (College of Agriculture and Natural Resources).

Membership: The UGEC consists of one faculty member from each department, elected by their departments for staggered two-year terms. The UGEC also includes one undergraduate student representative elected for a one-year term by the undergraduate student association. The Associate Dean for General Education Programs and the Assistant Dean for Administration, Planning, and Assessment serve as ex-officio members with voting privileges. The UGEC Chair is selected by the committee members.

5. Graduate Education Committee (GEC)

Purpose: Graduate education in the College is a joint function and responsibility of the College and its Departments. The Graduate Committee has as its primary responsibility coordinating and monitoring the quality and integrity of graduate programs housed in the College's Departments; it also recommends revisions to existing programs, curriculum, and courses to promote compliance with Middle States accreditation guidelines. The GEC sends its course and program recommendations to the Senate for final consent. As appropriate, recommendations regarding education preparation policy are also presented to the Dean and the Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education.

Membership: GEC consists of a tenure-track faculty member who serves as the graduate director from each Department or a faculty member with similar responsibilities, or where a Department has a committee responsible for graduate studies, a member of that committee who is selected by their departments for staggered two-year terms. The Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education, the Associate Director for Graduate Studies, and the Assistant Dean for Administration, Planning, and Assessment serve as ex-officio members with voting privileges. The GEC also includes one graduate student representative elected for a one-year term by the graduate student association. The GEC Chair is selected by the members and must be an associate or full professor.

CHAPTER IV. ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

ARTICLE I. Purpose and Functions

The College Administration shall provide leadership, supervision, and coordination of all educational programs. Its functions shall include, but not be limited to, providing leadership in:

- a) the identification of social, economic, and political trends which have relevance for the mission of the college;
- b) the development of innovative and/or experimental programs of education;
- c) the pursuit and conduct of excellent scholarly research;
- d) the facilitation of excellence in teaching and other academic pursuits of faculty, staff, and students;
- e) the development of effective educational service to the University, State, and profession; and
- f) the improvement of the quality of education and human services in the State of Maryland, the nation, and internationally.

ARTICLE II. Dean and Central Staff

Section 1. Designations

The chief administrator of the College is the Dean, who shall have central staff composed of Associate and Assistant Deans, assistants to the Dean, and authorized support personnel.

Section 2. Appointments

Recommendations for the appointment of the Dean shall be made by an ad hoc search and screening committee. The committee size and composition shall be determined by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The College Senate shall encourage the Provost to insure that a majority of committee members shall be tenure-track faculty members from the College elected by the faculty of the College Senate. All tenure-track faculty members in the College shall be eligible for such election, providing that the composition of the committee does not include more than one faculty member from the same department.

Assistants to the Dean and all supporting personnel shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the appropriate administrative officer, e.g., the Dean, Associate Dean, or Assistant Dean.

Section 3. Consultation with the College Senate

The Dean shall meet with the College Senate on a regular basis in an effort to secure advice with regard to policy and practice of the College. The Dean may request that the Senate Steering Committee place on the agenda of the College Senate such items as are seen fit. The Senate Steering Committee shall make every effort to grant such requests.

ARTICLE III. Administrative Units of the College

Section 1. Scope and Mission of Department

A department of the College shall consist of a group of faculty members with common or closely related disciplinary or mission-oriented interests. All faculty members or groups of faculty offering courses and programs in the College shall be members of at least one department. The immediate government of the department is vested in its departmental faculty, staff, and students as specified by the Plan of Organization of that department, which has jurisdiction over the interests of the department, including authority to determine all questions of departmental educational policy. Actions and policies which affect more than one department are subject to review and approval by the College Senate.

Section 2. Department Membership

All faculty who are eligible to be voting members of the CEA shall have the right to vote and participate in their respective departmental meetings. The department Plan of Organization shall specify which and under what conditions student and staff members shall enjoy the rights of participation and voting in departmental meetings.

Section 3. Department Administration

The chief administrative office of a department is the Chair, whose appointment shall be recommended to the Dean by a search committee composed of and elected by the department faculty, plus two faculty members from other departments of the College appointed by the College Senate. The Chairs of the departments of the College shall meet with the Dean, the Chair of the CEA, and whomever else the Dean specifies. This group

shall follow an agenda as set by the Dean, in consultation with its members. Regular minutes of these meetings shall be published.

Each department shall have an appropriate committee structure that represents all members of the department. The membership and method of selection of committees shall be determined by each department with the stipulation that faculty, as defined by the faculty membership for the CEA, shall constitute a voting majority of that determinative body. A committee specified in the Plan of Organization of the Department shall advise the Chair in the general administration of departmental affairs and shall also have at least a majority of faculty.

Each department Plan of Organization and its actual implementation shall be reviewed by the College Senate to ensure appropriate participation in departmental matters every five years, or sooner if so requested by 25% of any of the faculty, staff, or students who are members of the department.

Section 4. Grievances

Grievances concerning conditions of personal and/or professional welfare within departments shall be handled in accordance with a set of procedures applicable to all departments as established by the College Senate. In the absence of special procedures, the College shall conform with those established by the University Senate or other relevant bodies of the Campus.

ARTICLE IV. Special Administrative Units

Organizations in the College other than Departments shall be known as Special Administrative Units. They shall serve specific purposes established by the Dean with advice of the College Senate.

CHAPTER V. STAFF ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE

Function:

Staff concerns will be channeled through the College Staff Committee, whose function is to review existing college-wide policies regarding staff issues, such as workload, personnel, morale, hiring practices, equity considerations, and staff development. While the College Staff Committee does not have an administrative oversight function, on occasion it may have access to administrative data in order to evaluate current policy or make proposals for policy change.

Membership:

The College Staff Committee includes both exempt and non-exempt staff and will be composed of two staff members from each of the departments and four at-large staff members who work in offices of the College not associated with a specific department. The Assistant Dean for Assessment, Administration, and Planning will serve ex-officio on the committee. One staff Senator from the College Senate will be appointed and serve as a Senate liaison and voting member of the College Staff Committee.

CHAPTER VI. STUDENT ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE

Responsibility for creating a student organization for each department rests with the students and faculty of that department. Responsibility for creating an all-College student organization rests with the departmental student organizations. Aspects of student participation shall be established at an appropriate time after the creation of the student organization. Students are invited to communicate directly with the CEA, Senate, and committees that may be specified in the Bylaws.

CHAPTER VII. AMENDMENTS, REVIEWS, AND REVISIONS

ARTICLE I. Amendments

Amendments to the Plan of Organization may be proposed at any meeting of the CEA or College Senate during the academic year. Upon approval of the amendment by a majority of those eligible to vote and voting, any proposed amendment shall be submitted by mail to all members of the CEA eligible to vote within ten class days. An affirmative vote within two weeks of mailing by two-thirds of those voting shall constitute adoption.

ARTICLE II. Plan of Organization Review

This Plan of Organization, accompanying Bylaws and Plans of the departments shall be reviewed at least every fifth year by an ad hoc committee appointed by the College Senate. The first such review is to occur five years from the date of adoption of the Plan by the College.

ARTICLE III. Ratification

Adoption of a new Plan shall go into effect in the Spring following ratification. All procedures specified in the newly adopted Plan and Bylaws shall be in force. This includes, for example, elections to take place in accordance with the new rules as approved.

ARTICLE IV. Implementation

Implementation of the new Plan and Bylaws shall be facilitated by the College Senate Steering Committee and those additional persons invited by the Senate Steering Committee to assist.

CHAPTER VIII. BYLAWS

The CEA shall have the power to organize its constituents and to make bylaws and regulations for its own proceedings so long as those bylaws do not contravene the statutes of the University, the Powers of the Board of Regents, the powers delegated to the Chancellor and to the President, and this Plan of Organization.

ARTICLE I. Amendments

Amendments to the College Bylaws shall be presented in writing to the College Senate members ten working days in advance of any regular meeting and shall require approval by a majority vote of the members of the College Senate present and voting.

CHAPTER IX. RECALL AND MEMBERSHIP

ARTICLE I. Recall

A petition bearing the signatures of 20% of the members of the Assembly eligible to vote (as certified by the Secretary) to recall the Chair or Chair-Elect of the Assembly may be introduced by any member of the Assembly at any regularly scheduled or special meeting of the Assembly (see Chapter I, Article IV, Sections 1 and 2). A petition so introduced will require the Senate to schedule a special electronic vote within 14 days (see Chapter I, Article IV, Section 3) in which the officers shall be recalled by a simple majority vote of those members of the Assembly eligible to vote.

Officers or appointees of the Senate may be recalled by the Senate at any regular or special meeting of the Senate; any member of the Senate may introduce a motion to recall an officer or appointee. A simple majority of those present and eligible to vote shall be required for a recall.

ARTICLE II. Annual Roster of College Committees

At the outset of each school year, a list of persons serving on the College Senate and College Senate Committees (in addition to other College committees) is to be made available to faculty, staff, and students throughout the College. Faculty, staff, and students should consult their department Chair, unit director, or the Dean's office for a copy of the current membership list. Responsibility for preparation of this list is held by the College Senate Chair in cooperation with the Dean's office.



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	11-12-23
Title:	Representation of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics on the University Senate
Presenter:	Kenneth Fleischmann, Chair of the Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee
Date of SEC Review:	April 5, 2012
Date of Senate Review:	April 19, 2012
Voting (highlight one):	1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	<p>The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics (DIA) submitted a proposal to the University Senate in November 2011 stating that the DIA would like to be more centrally engaged in the campus and have Senate representation for coaches. Currently, coaches are not included in any of the established Senate constituencies and therefore do not have official representation or voice on the Senate. Representation for coaches in the Senate and its committees would give the DIA an official pathway to bring forward issues to the Senate and a voice in the decisions made on the University of Maryland campus.</p>
Relevant Policy # & URL:	N/A
Recommendation:	<p>The ERG Committee recommends the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coaches within the Department of Athletics should be given a single-member constituency category in Section 2.2, Single-Member Constituencies, of the Senate Bylaws The Director of Athletics should be made a non-voting ex-officio member of the Senate by the next Plan of Organization Review Committee (PORC). The Chair of the Coaches Council should be given an ex-officio seat on the Campus Affairs Committee Coaches, along with all other Single Member Constituencies, should be thoroughly reviewed for potential apportioned representation on the Senate by the next PORC.

Committee Work:	<p>The ERG Committee received a charge from the Senate Executive Committee in late November 2011 to review and respond to the DIA proposal.</p> <p>After meeting to discuss the data that would need to be collected to meet the elements of the charge, the ERG Committee reviewed the structure of the Athletics Department, the Human Resources employee category status definitions that encompassed coaches, and the current membership of the Senate as defined in the University Plan of Organization and the Senate Bylaws. ERG members discussed the elements of the charge and agreed on a series of recommendations to meet each element.</p> <p>After consulting with the Senate Parliamentarian, the ERG recommended that coaches be given a single-member constituency in the University Senate. The ERG met on March 28, 2012 and unanimously approved the recommendations.</p>
Alternatives:	The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics could not be given representation on the Senate and its committees.
Risks:	The coaches would remain without official representation or voice on the University Senate and would not have an official pathway to bring forward issues to the Senate or participate in the decisions made on the University of Maryland campus.
Financial Implications:	None
Further Approvals Required:	Senate Approval, Presidential Approval

Elections, Representation, and Governance (ERG) Committee
Representation of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics
on the University Senate
Senate Doc # 11-12-23
March 2012

Background

The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics (DIA) submitted a proposal (Appendix 2) to the University Senate in November 2011 stating that the DIA would like to be more centrally engaged in the campus and have Senate representation for coaches. Currently, coaches are not included in any of the established Senate constituencies and therefore do not have official representation or voice on the Senate. Representation for coaches in the Senate and its committees would give the DIA an official pathway to bring forward issues to the Senate and a voice in the decisions made on the University of Maryland campus.

Committee Work

The ERG Committee received a charge from the Senate Executive Committee in late November 2011 to review and respond to the DIA proposal. At the December 6th, 2011 meeting, the ERG Committee members discussed the data that would need to be compiled for the Committee's review and deliberations in order to respond to the elements of the charge.

At the February 2, 2012 meeting the ERG Committee reviewed the structure of the Athletics Department, the Human Resources employee category status definitions that encompassed coaches, the history of the Maryland Fire and Rescue Institute Senate representation, and the current membership of the Senate as defined in the University Plan of Organization and the Senate Bylaws. ERG members discussed the elements of the charge and agreed on a series of recommendations. Members of the Committee volunteered to draft sections of the report for review at the March ERG meeting.

At the March 28, 2012 meeting the ERG Committee reviewed the draft report and voted unanimously to approve the report and recommendations.

Recommendations

1. Consider whether the Director of Athletics should be made an ex-officio member of the Senate and whether that seat should be voting or non-voting status.

The ERG unanimously recommends that the Director of Athletics be made a non-voting ex-officio member of the Senate. This will give the Director of Athletics a similar role in the Senate in comparison with the heads of other major units, such as Vice Presidents and the directors of the Counseling Center and MFRI. As this would require a change to the

University Senate Plan of Organization, the ERG will ask that the Plan of Organization Committee (PORC) make this change during its next review in 2013.3

2. Consider whether coaches should be given a seat on the Senate. In the course of your review, we ask that you research the history of senate representation given to the Maryland Fire Rescue Institute (MFRI).

The ERG Committee unanimously recommends that coaches should have the opportunity to be represented on the Senate. However, in light of the relatively large number of full-time and part-time teaching faculty, research faculty, and adjuncts and professors of the practice who currently share a total of four single-member constituency seats, the ERG Committee identified a broader need to review whether some or all of the current single member constituencies should become apportioned constituencies on the Senate. Further, the ERG Committee concluded that this issue cannot be fully resolved in a satisfactory manner for coaches or for other single-member constituency faculty without modifying the University Plan of Organization, which is the role of the Plan of Organization Committee (PORC). Thus, the ERG recommends that the next PORC carefully review the single-member constituency issue and the best way to ensure that faculty within all of these categories, now including coaches, receive equitable treatment and have the opportunity to participate in shared governance through Senate representation. As an interim measure, the ERG recommends that a new single member constituency category be created for coaches.

2.2 Single Member Constituencies

The Senators defined in (a)-(h) below shall be voting members of the Senate. All elections held pursuant to this section shall be organized by the Senate Office.

- (a) Teaching Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Constituency as defined in Section 3.2 of the Plan shall elect two (2) Senators, for a term of one (1) year, their terms renewable for up to three (3) years. Full-time Instructor/Lecturers shall elect one (1) full-time representative and part-time Instructor/Lecturers shall elect one (1) part-time representative representing the Instructor/Lecturer constituency. When the Senate votes by constituencies, those Senators shall have the same voting rights as a Faculty Senator.
- (b) Research Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Constituency as defined in Section 3.2 of the Plan shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as a Faculty Senator.
- (c) The part-time undergraduate students shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have

the same voting rights as all other student Senators. A part-time student Senator who changes to full-time status subsequent to election may serve out his/her term.

- (d) The Contingent 2 Staff shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as all other Staff Senators. The Contingent 2 Staff Senator shall have been employed by the University for twelve months prior to their election.
- (e) Emeritus Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Constituency as defined in Section 3.2 of the Plan shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as a Faculty Senator.
- (f) The part-time graduate students shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as all other student Senators. A part-time student Senator who changes to full-time status subsequent to election may serve out his/her term.
- (g) Adjunct Professors and Professors of the Practice who are not members of the Faculty Constituency as defined in Section 3.2 of the Plan together shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as a Faculty Senator.
- (h) **Head coaches who are not members of the Faculty Constituency as defined in Section 3.2 of the University Plan of Organization together shall elect one Senator from among their ranks to serve for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as a Faculty Senator.**

3. If appropriate, consider whether coaches should be given a faculty senator seat or a single-member constituency seat.

As noted above, the ERG unanimously recommends that a broader review of single member constituencies be conducted by the next PORC. However, until this time, the ERG recommends that a single-member constituency Senate seat be created for coaches.

4. Consider whether the Chair of the Coaches Council should be given an ex-officio seat on the Campus Affairs Committee or other appropriate senate committee.

The ERG unanimously recommends that the Chair of the Coaches Council should be given an ex-officio seat on the Campus Affairs Committee. The addition of this seat is appropriate considering the role of the Committee to “review and create policy and procedures to protect the campus community in both external relationships, as well as internal operations” and the role that the coaches and the Department of Athletics play, particularly in creating and managing our external reputation. It will also give the Chair of the Coaches Council a similar role on the Campus Affairs Committee in comparison to the representative from University Relations, which is also an outwardly-facing unit.

6.2 Campus Affairs Committee:

6.2.a Membership:

- (1) The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; six (6) faculty members; two (2) undergraduate and two (2) graduate students; two (2) staff members; the President or a representative of the Student Government Association; the President of the Graduate Student Government or the President’s graduate student designee; and the following persons or a representative of each: the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Vice President for Administrative Affairs, the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Vice President for University Relations, ~~and~~ the Chief Diversity Officer, **and the Chair of the Coaches Council.**
- (2) When discussions of safety are on the agenda, the Chief of Police, the President’s Legal Office, the Director of Transportation Services, and other campus constituencies, as appropriate, shall be invited to participate or send a representative.
- (3) The Chair of this committee or a member designated by the Chair and approved by the Senate Executive Committee will serve as an ex officio member of the Athletic Council and the Campus Transportation Advisory Committee.

5. Consider whether the Chair or Vice-Chair of the Student Athletes Advisory Council (SAAC) should be given an ex-officio seat on the Student Affairs, Student Conduct, or other appropriate senate committees.

The ERG unanimously recommends that the current Senate committee structure provides sufficient opportunities for student athlete participation and that no additional ex-officio positions are warranted at this time.

In their deliberations, committee members agreed that student athletes must deal with a particular and unique set of concerns. It was also noted that the nature of this group, composed as it is of students from a variety of departments and programs across the University, has the potential to make it difficult for them to elect student Senators who will represent their interests. However, this is no less true for a variety of other groups on campus, such as students in the Greek system, on- or off-campus students, members of groups organized around particular ethnic or cultural affiliations, etc. As such, the committee saw no compelling reason to single out student athletes as a population deserving of exceptional access by granting them ex-officio seats on the Student Affairs Committee, the Student Conduct Committee, or any other standing committee of the Senate. Further, it should be noted that the Senate Bylaws allow up to one-half of the student positions on the Student Affairs Committee to be filled by non-Senators, and do not require that any of the student seats on the Student Conduct Committee be filled by Senators, suggesting there is already a significant opportunity for individuals from populations such as student athletes to participate. One possibility that the ERG discussed was recommending the Nominations Committee specifically recruit student athletes, or accord student athletes some degree of preference when filling seats on committees such as Student Affairs or Student Conduct. This was ultimately rejected for similar reasons, as granting one group preferential treatment is inherently unfair, and not in keeping with best practices in shared governance.

Nevertheless, the ERG is sensitive to the fact that student athletes, as well as other analogous groups on campus, interact with the University in a way different from that of many other student populations. The ERG is also committed to facilitating greater participation in shared governance by all members of the campus community. As such, the committee recommends that the Senate Office, in communicating the response of the Senate to Director Anderson, detail the variety of ways that student athletes may participate in the work of the Senate under the existing committee structure, so that the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics would have the opportunity to encourage student athletes to run for the Senate and/or volunteer to serve on relevant Senate committees such as Student Affairs and Student Conduct.

Appendices:


Appendix 1 – Charge

Appendix 2 – Proposal

Appendix 3 – Revisions to Senate Bylaws



University Senate CHARGE

Date:	December 5, 2011
To:	Kenneth Fleischmann Chair, Elections, Representation, & Governance Committee
From:	Eric Kasischke Chair, University Senate 
Subject:	Representation of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics on the University Senate
Senate Document #:	11-12-23
Deadline:	March 30, 2012

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) requests that the Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee review the attached proposal, “Representation of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics on the University Senate,” and evaluate whether the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) should be given representation on the Senate and its committees and, if needed, recommend appropriate changes to the Senate Bylaws.

Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Consider whether the Director of Athletics should be made an ex-officio member of the Senate and whether that seat should be voting or non-voting status.
2. Consider whether coaches should be given a seat on the Senate. In the course of your review, we ask that you research the history of senate representation given to the Maryland Fire Rescue Institute (MFRI).
3. If appropriate, consider whether coaches should be given a faculty senator seat or a single-member constituency seat.
4. Consider whether the Chair of the Coaches Council should be given an ex-officio seat on the Campus Affairs Committee or other appropriate senate committee.
5. Consider whether the Chair or Vice-Chair of the Student Athletes Advisory Council (SAAC) should be given an ex-officio seat on the Student Affairs, Student Conduct, or other appropriate senate committees.

We ask that you submit your report and recommendations to the Senate Office no later than March 30, 2012. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.



University Senate PROPOSAL FORM

Name:	Kevin Anderson, Director of Athletics
Date:	November 17, 2011
Title of Proposal:	Representation of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics on the University Senate
Phone Number:	X40013
Email Address:	kevina@umd.edu
Campus Address:	2618 Comcast Center
Unit/Department/College:	Intercollegiate Athletics
Constituency (faculty, staff, undergraduate, graduate):	Administration
Description of issue/concern/policy in question:	<p>The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) would like to be more centrally engaged in the campus. ICA is currently composed of 763 student athletes and 27 coaches of our athletic teams. The coaches in effect are teaching and mentoring student-athletes at the University in addition to coaching them.</p> <p>The coaches in Athletics would like an opportunity to become more involved in the affairs of campus. Missy Meharg, Head Coach of the Women's Field Hockey Team and Chair of the Coaches Council volunteered to serve on the Campus Affairs Committee. At the time, the President's Office made the assessment that coaches should be considered as part of the "faculty" constituency. Coach Meharg was given a seat on the committee for the 2011-2013 years and has been an active member of the committee. When the committee discussed the potential helmet policy this year, Coach Meharg was able to give them insight on the rationale for the recent Athletics requirement that all student-athletes wear a helmet when operating motorized scooters. It is this type of perspective that may be useful to the Senate. However, not having permanent ex-officio seat on the committee may not guarantee that involvement.</p> <p>The students and coaches involved in the athletics program are members of the campus community that are not officially represented on the University Senate. Representation on the Senate and its committees would give Athletics a pathway to bring campus issues to the Senate and a voice in the decisions made on our campus.</p>

Description of action/changes you would like to see implemented and why:	<p>ICA would like the Senate to consider allowing representation of members of Athletics on both the Senate and its committees as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Director of Athletics could be made a voting or non-voting ex-officio of the Senate. 2. The coaches could be allowed to elect a single seat as a “faculty” senator or as a “single-member constituency” senator on the Senate. 3. The Chair of the Coaches Council could be added to the membership of the Campus Affairs Committee as an ex-officio member. 4. The Chair of the Student Athletes Advisory Council (SAAC) could be added to the membership of the Student Affairs Committee as an ex-officio member. 5. The Vice Chair of SAAC could be added to the membership of the Student Conduct Committee as ex-officio member.
Suggestions for how your proposal could be put into practice:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Senate could amend its Bylaws to include a coach on the Senate as a single-member constituency senator. 2. The Senate could consider adding a coach as a “faculty” senator on the Senate in the Plan of Organization when it is reviewed next. 3. The Senate could amend its Bylaws to include the Chair of the Coaches Council as an ex-officio representative on the Campus Affairs Committee. 4. The Senate could amend its Bylaws to include the Chair and Vice-Chair of SAAC as ex-officio representatives on the Student Affairs and Student Conduct Committees.
Additional Information:	<p>N/A</p>

BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
University of Maryland, College Park
Amended March 8, 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLE 1 - <u>AUTHORIZATION</u>	3
ARTICLE 2 - <u>MEMBERSHIP</u>	3
ARTICLE 3 - <u>MEETINGS</u>	4
ARTICLE 4 - <u>EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE</u>	6
ARTICLE 5 - <u>COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE</u>	8
ARTICLE 6 - <u>STANDING COMMITTEE SPECIFICATIONS</u>	11
6.1 <u>ACADEMIC PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE</u>	11
6.2 <u>CAMPUS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE</u>	12
6.3 <u>COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES</u>	12-13
6.4 <u>EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE</u>	13
6.5 <u>ELECTIONS, REPRESENTATION, AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE</u>	13-14
6.6 <u>EQUITY, DIVERSITY, & INCLUSION COMMITTEE (FORMERLY HUMAN RELATIONS)</u>	14
6.7 <u>FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE</u>	14
6.8 <u>GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE</u>	15-16
6.9 <u>GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE</u>	16
6.10 <u>PROGRAMS, CURRICULA, AND COURSES COMMITTEE</u>	16-17
6.11 <u>STAFF AFFAIRS COMMITTEE</u>	18
6.12 <u>STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE</u>	18
6.13 <u>STUDENT CONDUCT COMMITTEE</u>	18-19
ARTICLE 7 - <u>UNIVERSITY COUNCILS</u>	19-21
ARTICLE 8 - <u>UNIVERSITY COUNCILS SPECIFICATIONS</u>	21-22
8.1 <u>UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COUNCIL</u>	21-22
8.2 <u>UNIVERSITY RESEARCH COUNCIL</u>	22
ARTICLE 9 - <u>DUTIES OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND DIRECTOR</u>	22-23
ARTICLE 10 - <u>ANNUAL TRANSITION OF THE SENATE</u>	23-24
APPENDIX 1 - <u>COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS AND TERMS</u>	25
APPENDIX 2 - <u>BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COUNCIL</u>	25-28
APPENDIX 3 - <u>PROCEDURES FOR ELECTIONS OF UMCP REPRESENTATIVES TO THE COUNCIL OF UNIVERSITY SYSTEM FACULTY (CUSF)</u>	28
<u>DATES OF APPROVAL, UPDATES, AND AMENDMENTS TO THE SENATE BYLAWS</u>	29

BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

The University of Maryland, College Park

ARTICLE 1 AUTHORIZATION

- 1.1 These *Bylaws of the University Senate* (hereafter referred to as the *Bylaws*) are adopted according to Article 7 of the *Plan of Organization* (hereafter referred to as the *Plan*), and are subject to amendment as provided for in the *Plan*.

ARTICLE 2 MEMBERSHIP

- 2.1 The members of the Senate are as designated in Article 3 of the *Plan* and further specified in 2.1 and 2.2 below. All elected members are subject to the conditions stated in the *Plan*, including its provisions for expulsion, recall, and impeachment (Article 4.10, 4.11, and 5.6 of the *Plan* and Article 2.3 below).

2.1.a Staff Senators

For the purpose of Senate representation, the Staff Constituency is divided into the following categories. Each category shall elect one Senator from among its ranks for each 200 staff members or major fraction thereof.

1. Executive, Administrative, and Managerial Staff
2. Professional Staff
3. Secretarial and Clerical Staff
4. Technical and Para-Professional Staff
5. Skilled Crafts
6. Service and Maintenance

Exempt staff are in categories 1 and 2; non-exempt staff are in categories 3-6.

- 2.1.b Staff member job categories will not include the category designated for the President, vice presidents, provosts, and deans if they hold faculty rank.
- 2.1.c Any individual within the faculty member voting constituency cannot be included in the staff member voting constituency or nominated for election as a Senate staff member. Staff candidates for the Senate must have been employed at the University of Maryland College Park for 12 months prior to standing as candidates for Senate. Staff members may not stand for Senate elections while in the probationary period of employment.
- 2.1.d An ex officio member denoted in the *Plan* (Article 3.6.a.) who is not precluded from staff member categories as noted in Articles 2.1.b and 2.1.c may be elected as a voting member of the Senate by an appropriate constituency. Such ex officio members should also have been employed by the University of Maryland College Park for 12 months prior to standing as candidates for the Senate.
- 2.1.e As noted in the *Plan* (Article 3.3.c), the term of each staff Senator shall be three (3) years. Terms of staff members will be staggered in such a way that for each term, one-third of the total members from a job category are serving the first year of their term. Not every member of a specific job category shall be elected in the same year except in the case that the job categories are redefined by the University or these *Bylaws*. In such a circumstance, at the completion of the election, from those members who were elected:
- (1) One-third of the members in a job category who received the lowest number of votes will serve a one-year term,
 - (2) One-third of the members in a job category who received the second lowest number of votes will serve two-year terms,
 - (3) One-third of the members in a job category who received the highest number of votes will serve

three year-terms.

A person serving a one-year term is defined not to have served a full term and is eligible for re-election to a full term the following year.

2.2 Single Member Constituencies

The Senators defined in (a)-(h) below shall be voting members of the Senate. All elections held pursuant to this section shall be organized by the Senate Office.

- (a) Teaching Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Constituency as defined in Section 3.2 of the Plan shall elect two (2) Senators, for a term of one (1) year, their terms renewable for up to three (3) years. Full-time Instructor/Lecturers shall elect one (1) full-time representative and part-time Instructor/Lecturers shall elect one (1) part-time representative representing the Instructor/Lecturer constituency. When the Senate votes by constituencies, those Senators shall have the same voting rights as a Faculty Senator.
- (b) Research Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Constituency as defined in Section 3.2 of the *Plan* shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as a Faculty Senator.
- (c) The part-time undergraduate students shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as all other student Senators. A part-time student Senator who changes to full-time status subsequent to election may serve out his/her term.
- (d) The Contingent 2 Staff shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as all other Staff Senators. The Contingent 2 Staff Senator shall have been employed by the University for twelve months prior to their election.
- (e) Emeritus Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Constituency as defined in Section 3.2 of the *Plan* shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as a Faculty Senator.
- (f) The part-time graduate students shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as all other student Senators. A part-time student Senator who changes to full-time status subsequent to election may serve out his/her term.
- (g) Adjunct Professors and Professors of the Practice who are not members of the Faculty Constituency as defined in Section 3.2 of the Plan together shall elect one (1) Senator from among their ranks for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as a Faculty Senator.
- (h) **Head coaches who are not members of the Faculty Constituency as defined in Section 3.2 of the University Plan of Organization together shall elect one Senator from among their ranks to serve for a term of one (1) year, renewable for up to three (3) years. When the Senate votes by constituencies, that Senator shall have the same voting rights as a Faculty Senator.**

- 2.3 If any elected Senator is absent from two (2) consecutive regularly scheduled meetings of the Senate without prior approval from the Office of the University Senate (Article 4.10.a of the *Plan*), the Executive Secretary and Director shall notify the constituency of this fact. Also in accordance with Article 4.9 and 4.10 of the *Plan*, until the member attends a meeting of the Senate, or the Senator is expelled, that Senator shall be counted in the total membership when a quorum is defined for a meeting.

ARTICLE 3

Amended March 8, 2012

MEETINGS

3.1 Regular Meetings:

The Senate shall schedule at least four (4) regular meetings each semester. The notice, agenda, and supporting documents shall be mailed, by campus or electronic-mail, from the Senate Office to the membership no later than one calendar week prior to each regular meeting unless otherwise approved by the Executive Committee.

3.2 Special Meetings:

3.2.a Special meetings of the Senate may be called in any of the following ways, with the matter(s) to be considered to be specified in the call:

- (1) By the presiding officer of the Senate;
- (2) By a majority vote of the Executive Committee of the Senate;
- (3) By written petition of a majority of the elected members of the Senate. The petition shall be delivered to the Chair or the Executive Secretary and Director of the Senate. The Chair shall give notice of arrangements for the meeting within seventy-two (72) hours of receipt of a valid petition; and
- (4) By resolution of the Senate.

3.2.b The notice of a special meeting shall include the agenda and shall be sent to the members of the Senate as far in advance of the meeting as possible. The agenda of a special meeting may specify a scheduled time of adjournment and provide information on adjourned meetings.

3.2.c The scheduling of a special meeting shall reflect the urgency of the matter(s) specified in the call, the requirement of reasonable notice, and the availability of the membership.

3.3 Openness of Meetings and Floor Privileges:

3.3.a Meetings of the Senate shall be open to all members of the campus community except when the meetings are being conducted in closed session.

3.3.b Representatives of the news media shall be admitted to all meetings of the Senate except when the meetings are conducted in closed session. The use of television, video, or recording equipment shall not be permitted except by express consent of the Senate.

3.3.c When a report of a committee of the Senate is being considered, members of that committee who are not members of the Senate may sit with the Senate and have a voice but not a vote in the deliberations of the Senate on that report.

3.3.d Any Senator may request the privilege of the floor for any member of the campus community to speak on the subject before the Senate. The Chair shall rule on such requests.

3.3.e By vote of the Senate, by ruling of the Chair, or by order of the Executive Committee included in the agenda of the meeting, the Senate shall go into closed session. The ruling of the Chair and the order of the Executive Committee shall be subject to appeal, but the Chair shall determine whether such appeal shall be considered in open or closed session.

3.3.f While in closed session, the meeting shall be restricted to voting members of the Senate (Article 3 in the *Plan*), to members granted a voice but not a vote (Articles 3.6 and 5.2.c of the *Plan*), to the Executive Secretary and Director, to the parliamentarian and any staff required for keeping minutes and audio recordings, and to other persons expressly invited by the Senate.

3.4 Rules for Procedure:

3.4.a The version of *Robert's Rules of Order* that shall govern the conduct of Senate meetings shall be *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*.

- 3.4.b A quorum for meetings shall be defined as a majority of elected Senators who have not received prior approval for absence from the Office of the University Senate, or fifty (50) Senators, whichever number is higher. For the purpose of determining a quorum, ex officio members with or without vote shall not be considered.

ARTICLE 4 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

4.1 Membership and Election:

- 4.1.a As set forth in the *Plan* (Article 8.2), the members of the Executive Committee shall include the Chair and Chair-Elect of the Senate, and twelve (12) members elected from the voting membership of the Senate. One of the two staff members shall be elected by and from the Senators representing exempt staff, and the other shall be elected by and from the Senators representing nonexempt staff.
- 4.1.b Non-voting members of the Executive Committee shall be the President and the Senior Vice President and Provost or their representatives; the Executive Secretary and Director of the Senate, who shall be secretary of the Executive Committee; and the Parliamentarian.
- 4.1.c The election of the Executive Committee shall be scheduled as a special order at the transitional meeting of the Senate in the Spring Semester, but in no case shall it precede the election of the Chair-Elect as provided for in the *Plan* (Article 5.3). In the event of a tie vote in the election for members of the Executive Committee, a ballot will be mailed to each Senator as soon as the votes are counted and the tie discovered. Ballots are to be returned within one (1) week from the date mailed.
- 4.1.d In the event of a vacancy on the Executive Committee, the available candidate who had received the next highest number of votes in the annual election for the Executive Committee shall fill the remainder of the unexpired term.

4.2 Charge: The Executive Committee shall exercise the following functions:

- 4.2.a Assist in carrying into effect the actions of the Senate;
- 4.2.b Act for the Senate as provided for by and subject to the limitations stated in Article 4.3;
- 4.2.c Act as an initiating body suggesting possible action by the Senate;
- 4.2.d Review and report to the Senate on administrative implementation of policies adopted by the Senate;
- 4.2.e Prepare the agenda for each Senate meeting as provided for by and subject to limitations stated in Article 4.4;
- 4.2.f Serve as a channel through which any member of the campus community may introduce matters for consideration by the Senate or its committees;
- 4.2.g Prepare and submit reports on the Senate's work to the President and the campus community;
- 4.2.h Review the operations of the Office of the University Senate in January of each year, and make recommendations to the President for improvements in those operations and for the replacement or continuation of the Executive Secretary and Director;
- 4.2.i Serve as the channel through which the Senate and the campus community may participate in the selection of officers of the campus and the University;
- 4.2.j Perform such other functions as may be given it in other provisions of these *Bylaws* and the *Plan*; and

- 4.2.k Conduct elections, by Senators representing faculty constituencies, for membership on system-wide bodies requiring faculty representatives.

4.3 Rules Governing Executive Committee Action for the Senate:

- 4.3.a Where time or the availability of the membership precludes a meeting of the Senate, as, for example, during the summer or between semesters, the Executive Committee may act for the Senate.
- 4.3.b A report of all actions taken by the Executive Committee when acting for the Senate, with supporting material, shall be included with the agenda of the next regular meeting of the Senate. By written request of ten (10) Senators, received by the Chair of the Senate prior to the call to order of that meeting, any Executive Committee action on behalf of the Senate shall be vacated and the item in question placed on the agenda as a special order. If any such item is not petitioned to the floor, it shall stand as an approved action of the Senate.

4.4 Rules Governing Preparation of the Senate Agenda:

- 4.4.a The order of business for regular meetings shall be as follows:
- (1) Call to order;
 - (2) Approval of the minutes of the previous regular meeting and any other intervening special meeting(s);
 - (3) Report of the Chair;
 - (4) Report of the Executive Committee;
 - (5) Special orders of the day;
 - (6) Unfinished business;
 - (7) Reports of committees;
 - (8) Other new business; and
 - (9) Adjournment.
- 4.4.b For regular meetings the Executive Committee shall consider all submissions for inclusion on the Senate agenda. The Executive Committee may not alter a submission, but may delay its inclusion, may include it on the agenda of a special meeting, may submit the material directly to a committee of the Senate, or may refuse to place it on the agenda if the material is inappropriate, incomplete, or unclear. The party making a submission shall be notified of the action taken in this regard by the Executive Committee.
- 4.4.c The order of business for a special meeting shall be as follows:
- (1) Call to order;
 - (2) Statement by the Chair of the nature and origin of the call of the meeting;
 - (3) The special order;
 - (4) Other business as determined by the Executive Committee; and
 - (5) Adjournment.

- 4.4.d For a special meeting the agenda shall include the matter(s) specified in the call of that meeting as

the Special Order. Other items may be included on the agenda as the Executive Committee deems appropriate.

- 4.5 Meetings of the Executive Committee: A quorum of the Executive Committee shall be seven (7) voting members. Minutes of the meetings shall be kept. A report of the Executive Committee shall be submitted to the next regular meeting of the Senate. The Executive Committee shall meet at the call of the Chair or by petition of seven (7) voting members of the Executive Committee, or by petition of twenty-five (25) voting members of the Senate.
- 4.6 The Senate Budget: The Executive Secretary and Director shall be responsible for the Senate budget, shall consult with the Executive Committee on the preparation of the budget request, and shall report to the Executive Committee the funds received. The Executive Secretary and Director shall make an annual report to the Senate on expenditure of the Senate budget. Consent of the Executive Committee shall be required before any change in the budgeted use of Senate funds involving more than ten percent (10%) of the total may be undertaken.
- 4.7 **Referral of Items to Standing Committees:** The Executive Committee shall refer items to the standing committees.
 - 4.7.a The Executive Committee shall refer an item to an appropriate committee when instructed by the Senate or when requested by the President, or when petitioned by 150 members of the Senate electorate.
 - 4.7.b The Executive Committee may also refer any item it deems appropriate, and the standing committee shall give due consideration to such requests from the Executive Committee.
 - 4.7.c The Chair of the Senate may, as need requires, act for the Executive Committee and refer items to standing committees. All such actions shall be reported at the next meeting of the Executive Committee.
- 4.8 To the extent permitted by law and University policy, the records of the Senate shall be open.

ARTICLE 5 COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

- 5.1 **Standing Committees - Specifications:** The specifications of each standing committee of the Senate shall state its name, its specific charge, and any exceptions or additions to the basic charge to standing committees stated in Article 5.2. The specifications shall list all voting ex officio members and may restrict committee composition.
 - 5.1.a General Standing Committees: In an appropriate section of Article 6 there shall be specifications for each general committee.
- 5.2 **Standing Committees - Basic Charge:** In its area of responsibility, as defined in its specifications, each committee shall be an arm of the Senate with the following powers:
 - (1) To formulate and review policies to be established by the Senate according to the *Plan* (Article 1);
 - (2) To review established policies and their administration and to recommend any changes in policies or their administration that may be desirable;
 - (3) To serve in an advisory capacity, upon request, regarding the administration of policies;
 - (4) To function on request of the President or of the Executive Committee as a board of appeal with reference to actions and/or decisions made in the application of policies; and
 - (5) To recommend the creation of special subcommittees (Article 5.8) when deemed necessary.

5.3 **Standing Committees - General Committee Operation:**

5.3.a Agenda Determination:

- (1) Nonprocedural items shall be placed on the agenda of a general committee by vote of that committee, by referral from the Executive Committee (Article 4.7), or by referral of policy recommendations. The committee shall determine the priorities of its agenda items.
- (2) A general committee shall have principal responsibility for identifying matters of present and potential concern to the campus community within its area of responsibility. Such matters should be placed on the agenda of the general committee.

5.3.b Rules for Procedure of Standing Committees: The version of *Robert's Rules of Order* that shall govern the conduct of Standing Committees shall be *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*.

5.3.c Quorum Requirements of Standing Committees: Unless a quorum number is specified in the membership description of a committee, the quorum shall be a majority of voting members of the committee.

5.4 **Standing Committees - Reporting Responsibilities:** Each committee shall be responsible through its presiding officer for the timely delivery of the following reports.

5.4.a The Executive Secretary and Director shall receive an announcement of each meeting of the committee stating the time and place of the meeting with agenda items. It shall be sent as far in advance of the meeting as possible.

5.4.b The committee shall report its progress on agenda items as required by the Executive Secretary and Director or the Chair of the Senate.

5.4.c Reports providing information and/or recommendations to the Senate shall be submitted to the Executive Committee for inclusion on the Senate agenda. Reports resulting from the committee's advisory or board of appeals function shall be submitted to the appropriate Senate or campus officer, and the Executive Committee notified of the submission.

5.4.d Upon written request of at least four (4) members of a committee, the presiding officer of that committee shall include a minority statement with any committee report. Those requesting inclusion need not support the substance of the minority statement.

5.4.e An annual report shall be presented to the Chair of the Senate at the end of the academic year, or, if approved by the Chair, no later than August 16, for submission to the Senate. The report shall include a list of all items placed on the committee's agenda, noting the disposition of each. In the case of committees with little activity, the committee may recommend inactive status the ensuing year.

5.5 **Standing Committees - Selecting Members:** Persons shall be named to standing committees in accordance with the procedures listed below.

5.5.a The Committee on Committees, through the Senate office, shall maintain a database of the qualifications, preferred committees, and past committee service of members of the Senate electorate. Opportunity to update this database shall be provided annually. In the case of students, new information will be solicited through the most practical means. In the case of staff and faculty, current information will be forwarded with a request that the elector update the information. In conjunction with this annual update, the Senate office shall circulate prepared information on the duties, powers, and membership specifications of each committee and council to each unit, to all new electors, and to students requesting the information.

5.5.b The Committee on Committees shall submit nominations as necessary to maintain full and effective committee membership. No person shall be nominated for a committee position without consenting to serve on that committee, either through indicated preference or explicit agreement. In making nominations, the Committee on Committees shall keep in view the continuing membership of the

committee to ensure that the full membership complies with specifications of the *Plan* and these *Bylaws*. Committee members shall be nominated consistent with requirements for diversity specified in Section 8.1 of the *Plan*.

- 5.5.c Ex officio members named in a committee's specifications shall be voting members unless otherwise specified in the *Bylaws*. Upon recommendation of the Committee on Committees, the Executive Committee may appoint ex officio members with particular expertise or benefit to the committee. Such members shall serve with voice, but without vote. The Executive Committee is empowered to make such changes in non-voting ex officio membership as appropriate.
- 5.5.d The Committee on Committees shall forward nominations to the Executive Committee to place on the Senate agenda for approval. Each nominee shall be identified by name, constituency, and Senate committee experience. The notice of nomination shall also include the name and constituency of continuing members of the committee, and the name and office of the current ex officio members, listed for information only. The nominations shall be subject to action by the Senate consistent with the *Plan* and the specifications of these *Bylaws*.
- 5.5.e Terms on standing committees shall be two (2) years for faculty and staff, and one (1) year for students. Appointments to two-year terms shall be staggered: that is, as far as practical, half of the terms from each faculty or staff constituency shall expire each year. Terms shall begin on the date of the transitional meeting of the Senate in the appropriate year.
- 5.5.f A member of a standing committee whose term is expiring may be appointed to another term, subject to restrictions (1) and (2) below. The Committee on Committees is particularly charged to consider the reappointment of active student members.
 - (1) No reappointment shall be made that would cause the appointee to serve longer than four consecutive years on the same committee.
 - (2) At most, half of the non-student members of a committee whose terms are expiring in any given year may be reappointed.
- 5.5.g Terms as presiding officer of a committee shall be one year. A presiding officer may be reappointed if his/her tenure as a committee member is continuing; however, no one shall serve as presiding officer of a committee for more than two (2) consecutive years.
- 5.5.h Appointments of the presiding officers of committees shall be designated as the annual committee slate and shall be approved by the Senate at an appropriate meeting. Appointments to unexpired terms shall be for the remainder of the unexpired term and shall be acted upon by the Senate as placed on the agenda by the Executive Committee.

5.6 **Standing Committees - Replacing Presiding Officers and Members:** The presiding officer and members of any active standing committee may be replaced for cause after inquiry by the Executive Committee, subject to approval by the Senate (see Article 5.6.c).

5.6.a Cause, for presiding officers, is defined as the following:

- (1) Failure to activate the committee during the first semester after appointment in order to organize its business and determine an agenda; or
- (2) Failure to activate the committee in order to respond to communications referred from the Executive Committee; or
- (3) Failure to activate the committee in order to carry out specific charges required in Article 6 or other Senate documents.

5.6.b Cause, for members, is defined as the following:

- (1) Continual absence from committee meetings and/or lack of participation in committee activities;
or

- (2) Lack of registration on campus for students or termination of employment on campus for faculty and staff.

5.6.c Procedure for replacing presiding officers and members:

- (1) The decision to replace a presiding officer rests with the Executive Committee; and
- (2) Requests for replacing a committee member shall be submitted by the presiding officer of a committee to the Executive Committee; such requests will contain a statement citing the appropriate "cause."

5.6.d When the Executive Committee decides to replace a presiding officer or committee member, it shall request the Committee on Committees to identify a suitable replacement.

5.7 **Standing Committees - Appointing Special Subcommittees:** A standing committee of the Senate may appoint special subcommittees to assist in the effective performance of its responsibilities. Persons appointed to special subcommittees who are not members of standing committees must be approved by the Executive Committee. The Chair of any special subcommittee must be a member of the standing committee making the appointment.

5.8 **Special Committees:** A special committee of the Senate may be established by resolution of the Senate to carry out a specified task. The empowering resolution shall also stipulate the means of selecting the committee and any restrictions on its composition. The committee shall function until the completion of its tasks or until discharged by the Senate. A final report of its work shall be presented to the Senate. Members shall serve for the duration of the committee unless otherwise specified by the Senate.

ARTICLE 6 STANDING COMMITTEE SPECIFICATIONS

6.1 **Academic Procedures and Standards Committee:**

- 6.1.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; ten (10) faculty members; three (3) undergraduate and two (2) graduate students; and the following persons or a representative of each: the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Director of Undergraduate Admissions, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies, and the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School.
- 6.1.b Quorum: A quorum of the Academic Procedures and Standards Committee shall be nine (9) voting members.
- 6.1.c Charge: The committee shall formulate and continually review policies, rules, and regulations governing the admission, readmission, academic standing, and dismissal of all students for academic deficiency.
- 6.1.d Charge: The committee shall continually review policies and procedures for academic advisement, scheduling of classes, and registration.
- 6.1.e Charge: The committee shall formulate and continually review policies to be observed by the instructional staff in conducting classes, seminars, examinations, students' research, and student evaluations.
- 6.1.f Policies, rules, and regulations exclusively governing admission, readmission, scholastic standing, and dismissal of graduate students for academic deficiency shall be reviewed by an appropriate committee of the Graduate School. Such policies, rules, and regulations will be transmitted by the Graduate School directly to the Senate through the Executive Committee. Policies, rules, and regulations that concern both graduate and undergraduate matters shall be considered by both the Educational Affairs Committee and the appropriate committee of the Graduate School.

6.2 Campus Affairs Committee:

6.2.a Membership:

- (1) The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; six (6) faculty members; two (2) undergraduate and two (2) graduate students; two (2) staff members; the President or a representative of the Student Government Association; the President of the Graduate Student Government or the President's graduate student designee; and the following persons or a representative of each: the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Vice President for Administrative Affairs, the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Vice President for University Relations, ~~and~~ the Chief Diversity Officer, **and the Chair of the Coaches Council.**
- (2) When discussions of safety are on the agenda, the Chief of Police, the President's Legal Office, the Director of Transportation Services, and other campus constituencies, as appropriate, shall be invited to participate or send a representative.
- (3) The Chair of this committee or a member designated by the Chair and approved by the Senate Executive Committee will serve as an ex officio member of the Athletic Council and the Campus Transportation Advisory Committee.

6.2.b Quorum: A quorum of the Campus Affairs Committee shall be nine (9) voting members.

6.2.c Charge: The committee shall formulate and continually review policies and regulations affecting the total campus, its functions, its facilities, its internal operation and external relationships, including the awarding of campus prizes and honors, and make recommendations concerning the future of the campus.

6.2.d Charge: The committee shall establish procedures for the periodic review of campus level administrators.

6.2.e Charge: The committee shall gather community input on safety and security issues and shall act as a liaison between the police and the campus community. The committee shall provide an annual report to the Senate regarding this charge.

6.3 Committee on Committees:

6.3.a Membership and terms:

- (1) As set forth in the *Plan* (Article 8.3.a), the Committee on Committees shall be chaired by the Chair-Elect of the Senate.
- (2) Besides the Chair-Elect of the Senate, the voting membership, as defined in the *Plan* (Article 8.3.a), shall consist of six (6) faculty members, with no more than one (1) from any college, elected by faculty Senators; two (2) staff members elected by staff Senators; and two (2) students elected by student Senators.
- (3) Students are elected to serve for one (1) year, faculty and staff for two (2) years, whether or not their membership in the Senate continues beyond their first year of service in the committee.
- (4) Terms of faculty and staff members are staggered in such a way that, at any time, no more than three (3) faculty members and one (1) staff member are serving the second year of their term.
- (5) In the event of a vacancy on the Committee on Committees, the available candidate who had received the next highest number of votes in the last annual election for the Committee on Committees, subject to provisions in 6.3.a(2), shall fill the remainder of the unexpired term.

6.3.b Charge:

- (1) As set forth in the *Plan* (Article 8.3.b), responsibilities of the Committee on Committees include:

- (a) Identification and recruitment of individuals for service on Senate committees,
 - (b) Identification and recruitment of individuals to serve as representatives of the Senate on University committees.
 - (c) Identification and recruitment of individuals to serve as representatives of the Senate on University committees.
- (2) Additional duties include
- (a) Identification of individuals for service on System committees,
 - (b) Ongoing assessment of the effectiveness of committees, and recommendation for improvements and changes in the operations and structure of the Elections, Representation and Governance Committee and the Executive Committee.
- 6.3.c Operation: The Committee on Committees shall follow the procedures specified for standing committees in Article 5 above, with the exception of 5.5.

6.4 **Educational Affairs Committee:**

- 6.4.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; twelve (12) faculty members; two (2) staff members; two (2) undergraduate students and one (1) graduate student; the President or a representative of the Student Government Association; the President of the Graduate Student Government or the President's graduate student designee; and the following persons or a representative of each: the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Director of the Honors College, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies, and the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School. The presiding officers of the Program, Curricula, and Courses (PCC) and the General Education Committees shall be non-voting, ex officio members.
- 6.4.b Quorum: A quorum of the Educational Affairs Committee shall be eleven (11) voting members.
- 6.4.c Charge: The committee shall formulate and continually review plans and policies to strengthen the educational system of the College Park campus. The committee shall receive ideas, recommendations, and plans for educational innovations from members of the campus community and others. The committee shall inform itself of conditions in the colleges, schools, and other academic units, and shall propose measures to make effective use of the resources of the campus for educational purposes.

6.5 **Elections, Representation, and Governance Committee:**

- 6.5.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; seven (7) faculty members; two (2) staff members; two (2) undergraduate and two (2) graduate students; and the Director of Human Resources and the Associate Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment.
- 6.5.b Quorum: A quorum of the Elections, Representation, and Governance Committee shall be eight (8) voting members.
- 6.5.c Charge: The committee shall review and recommend policies regarding the conduct of elections, determine correct apportionments for all constituencies, and investigate and adjudicate all charges arising from the management and results of Senate elections.
- 6.5.d Charge: The committee shall determine the correct apportionment for all constituencies every five (5) years in association with any review or revision of the *Plan* (Articles 3.8 and 6.3 of the *Plan*).

- 6.5.e Charge: The committee shall supervise all Senatorial elections and referenda in accordance with the *Plan* (Article 4.2), and shall cooperate with certain constituencies in their nomination and election processes in accordance with the *Plan* (Article 4.4) or as requested by the Executive Committee.
- 6.5.f Charge: The committee shall establish appropriate procedures for the tallying and reporting of election results (Article 4.8 of the *Plan*), and other such duties as appropriate (Articles 3.3.b and 3.4.b(2) of the *Plan*).
- 6.5.g Charge: The committee shall review the plans of organization of the colleges, schools, and other units, in accordance with the *Plan* (Article 11).
- 6.5.h Charge: The committee shall review and observe the operation and effectiveness of the University Senate and make any appropriate recommendations for improvements.
- 6.5.i Charge: The committee shall receive all petitions for impeachment of the Chair or Chair-Elect in accordance with the *Plan* (Article 5.6).
- 6.5.j Charge: The committee shall initiate procedures for expelling Senators in accordance with the *Plan* (Article 4.10).
- 6.5.k Charge: The committee shall receive all petitions for the recall of Senators in accordance with the *Plan* (Article 4.11).

6.6 **Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion Committee:**

- 6.6.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; four (4) undergraduate and two (2) graduate students; six (6) faculty members; three (3) non-exempt staff members; the Director of the Office of Diversity Education and Compliance; one (1) exempt staff member or a Director from the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost; one (1) exempt staff member or a Director from the Division of Administrative Affairs; one (1) exempt staff member or a Director from the Division of Student Affairs; and the following persons or a representative of each: the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Vice President for Administrative Affairs, and the Vice President for Student Affairs.
- 6.6.b Quorum: A quorum of the Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion Committee shall be eleven (11) voting members.
- 6.6.c Charge: The committee shall carry out its responsibilities as detailed in Article 1, Section E of the Code on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, University of Maryland, College Park, and recommend any appropriate changes in the Code. It shall consider programs for improving equity, diversity, and inclusiveness at the University.

6.7 **Faculty Affairs Committee:**

- 6.7.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; ten (10) faculty members, of whom four (4) shall be senators and two (2) must be untenured; one (1) undergraduate student and two (2) graduate students; one (1) staff member; and the following persons or a representative of each: the President, the Senior Vice President and Provost, and the Director of Human Resources.
- 6.7.b Quorum: A quorum of the Faculty Affairs Committee shall be eight (8) voting members.
- 6.7.c Charge: The committee shall formulate and continually review policies pertaining to faculty life, employment, academic freedom, morale, and perquisites.
- 6.7.d Charge: The committee shall work for the advancement of academic freedom and the protection of faculty and research interests.
- 6.7.e Charge: The committee shall, in consultation with colleges, schools, and other academic units,

establish procedures for the periodic review of academic administrators below the campus level.

6.8 General Education Committee:

6.8.a Membership: The committee shall consist of:

- (1) A presiding officer, who is a member of the faculty and is appointed by the chair of the Senate;
- (2) Twelve (12) faculty members consisting of:
 - (a) One (1) representative from each of the following entities: the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources; the School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation; the College of Arts and Humanities; the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences; the Robert H. Smith School of Business and Management; the College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences; the College of Education; the A. James Clark School of Engineering; the College of Information Studies; the Philip Merrill College of Journalism; the School of Public Health; and the School of Public Policy;
- (3) Four (4) students, of whom at least one (1) must be an undergraduate student and at least one (1) must be a graduate student, from four (4) different entities listed in 6.8.a(2)(a) above and those under the Office of Undergraduate Studies.
- (4) The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies, the Director of the Honors College, the Executive Director of College Park Scholars (or their designees), and the Associate Dean for General Education shall serve as voting ex officio members.

6.8.b Charge:

- (1) To facilitate the ongoing Core Liberal Arts and Sciences Program for students under the Core requirements, the General Education Committee shall exercise continuing supervisory authority and general oversight of the Core Liberal Arts and Sciences Program at the University of Maryland consistent with its authority as mandated by the report on undergraduate education entitled Promises to Keep: The College Park Plan for Undergraduate Education (Pease Report), adopted by the College Park Senate in March 1988 and in coordination with the General Education Program at the University of Maryland as described in the 2010 document Transforming General Education at the University of Maryland and the General Education Implementation Plan approved by the University Senate in February 2011. It shall also make periodic reports to the Senate on its evaluation of the effectiveness of the program and make any recommendations for revision or improvements it deems appropriate.
- (2) The General Education Committee shall exercise broad oversight and supervision of the General Education Program at the University of Maryland as described in the 2010 document Transforming General Education at the University of Maryland and the General Education Implementation Plan approved by the University Senate in February 2011. The General Education Committee shall review and make recommendations concerning the General Education Program to the Senate and the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies. Such recommendations shall include, as the committee deems appropriate, the program's requirements and its vision, especially with regard to evaluating trends, reviewing learning outcomes, and maintaining the balance of courses in the General Education categories.

6.8.c The committee may, under the provisions of Section 5.7, establish subcommittees for each major segment of its work. A member of the General Education Committee shall serve as the presiding officer of each subcommittee. The other members may, but need not, be members of the General Education Committee as the General Education Committee and the Senate Executive Committee deem appropriate.

6.8.d Relation of the General Education Committee to the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies:

- (1) The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies will prepare an annual report on the status of the General Education Program and will send the report to the General Education Committee by September 1.
- (2) The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies will meet with the General Education Committee as needed to discuss or update the report. Topics will include but not be limited to: the membership and ongoing work of the General Education Faculty Boards; the proposal and approval process for General Education courses; the learning outcomes for the different course categories; areas where additional courses or rebalancing may be needed; trends and developments that may impact the General Education Program; and informational resources for students, faculty, and advisors about the General Education Program.
- (3) The Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies shall inform the committee of modifications in the proposal or review process, the disposition of recommendations from the committee, and any other changes regarding the implementation of the General Education Program as specifically delegated to that office.

6.9 **Governmental Affairs Committee:**

- 6.9.a Membership: The committee shall consist of the Chair-Elect of the Senate; the current Chair of the Senate; the immediate past Chair of the Senate; a federal and a state campus legislative liaison appointed by the President; two (2) faculty members; one (1) undergraduate student; one (1) graduate student; one (1) non-exempt staff member; one (1) exempt staff member; and such additional non-voting, ex officio members as shall be appointed under Section 5.5.c of these *Bylaws*. Committee members shall not be limited to two consecutive terms as specified in Section 5.5.f(1) of these *Bylaws*. To assure continuity, selection of members should be made in a way that will return at least four (4) of the members of the immediate past committee to the newly appointed committee.
- 6.9.b Charge: The committee shall initiate activities to provide contact with and information for executive and legislative bodies; shall serve as an advisory body to the President concerning campus needs requiring legislation; and shall keep the Senate abreast of legislative issues important to the campus.

6.10 **Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee:**

- 6.10.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; ten (10) faculty members; two (2) undergraduate students and one (1) graduate student; and the following persons or a representative of each: the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School, and the Dean of Libraries.
- 6.10.b Quorum: A quorum of the Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee shall be nine (9) voting members.
- 6.10.c Charge: The committee shall formulate, review, and make recommendations to the Senate concerning policies related both (1) to the establishment, modification, or discontinuance of academic programs, curricula, and courses; and (2) to the establishment, reorganization, or abolition of colleges, schools, academic departments, or other units that offer credit-bearing programs of instruction or regularly offer courses for credit.
- 6.10.d Charge: The committee shall review and make recommendations to the Senate in at least the areas designated by (1) through (3) below. Recommendations in these areas are not subject to amendment on the Senate floor unless a detailed objection describing the area of concern has been filed with the Senate Office at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting at which the

recommendations will be introduced. The committee will announce proposed recommendations to the campus community sufficiently in advance of the meeting at which they are to be considered so as to allow time for concerned parties to file their objections.

- (1) All proposals for the establishment of a new academic program, for the discontinuance of an existing academic program, for the merger or splitting of existing academic programs, or for the renaming of an existing academic program;
- (2) All proposals for the creation, abolition, merger, splitting, or change of name of colleges, schools, departments of instruction, or other units that offer credit-bearing programs of instruction or regularly offer courses for credit; and
- (3) All proposals to reassign existing units or programs to other units or programs.

6.10.e Charge: The committee shall review and shall directly advise the Office of Academic Affairs concerning proposals to modify the curricula of existing academic programs, or to establish citation programs consistent with college rules approved by the Senate. The committee shall inform the Senate of its actions in these cases.

6.10.f Charge: The committee shall review, establish, and advise the Vice President's Advisory Committee concerning policies for adding, deleting, or modifying academic courses.

6.10.g Charge: The committee shall be especially concerned with the thoroughness and soundness of all proposals, and shall evaluate each according to the mission of the University, the justification for the proposed action, the availability of resources, the appropriateness of the sponsoring group, and the proposal's conformity with existing regulations. The committee shall be informed of any recommendations made by the Academic Planning Advisory Committee concerning resource issues, the consistency of the proposed action with the University's mission and strategic directions, or both.

6.10.h The committee shall meet regularly as needed.

6.10.i Relation of the Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee to the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost.

- (1) The committee, in consultation with the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, shall determine the requirements for supporting documentation and the procedures for review for all proposals.
- (2) The committee shall be informed by the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost of all proposed modifications to existing programs and curricula. After consulting with the presiding officer of the committee, the Provost's Office shall act on all minor changes that are not of a policy nature.
- (3) The committee shall be informed by the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost of all changes made pursuant to 6.10.h(2). The committee shall be informed by the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost of all other changes in academic curricula whose approval has been specifically delegated to that office. In particular, this includes the approval to offer existing academic programs through distance education or at a new off-campus location.

6.10.j Relationship of the Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee to the Graduate School: Proposals concerned with graduate programs and curricula shall receive the review specified by the Graduate School, in addition to the review of the Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee. Any such proposal whose approval has been denied by the Graduate School shall not be considered by the committee.

6.11 **Staff Affairs Committee:**

6.11.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; ten (10) staff members,

including a member, preferably a Senator, from each of the elected staff categories; three (3) faculty members; two (2) students; the Director of Human Resources; and one (1) representative each from the offices of the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Vice President for Administrative Affairs, the Vice President for University Relations, and the Vice President for Student Affairs. The elected UMCP representatives to the Council of University System Staff (CUSS), the two staff representatives on the Executive Committee, and two Category II contingent employees shall also be members of the committee.

- 6.11.b Quorum: A quorum of the Staff Affairs Committee shall be twelve (12) voting members.
- 6.11.c Charge: The committee shall formulate and continually review campus policies affecting staff members, including policies regarding periodic review of campus departments and administrators that employ staff members.
- 6.11.d Charge: The committee shall assist the Office of the University Senate in soliciting nominations and encouraging participation in elections of staff Senators as specified in Article 4.4 of the *Plan*.
- 6.11.e Charge: Staff Affairs shall assist the Committee on Committees and the Senate Executive Committee in identifying and recruiting staff representatives for campus and Senate committees, including system-wide activities involving staff.
- 6.11.f Charge: The committee shall administer the Council of University System Staff (CUSS) nomination and election process. Definitions of eligible staff shall be defined by the Board of Regents and CUSS.
- 6.11.g Charge: The committee shall actively promote and provide orientation and opportunities for staff involvement in shared governance at every administrative level.

6.12 **Student Affairs Committee:**

- 6.12.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; ten (10) undergraduate students, of whom five (5) must be Senators; four (4) graduate students, of whom two (2) must be Senators; three (3) faculty members; two (2) staff members; the President or a representative of the Student Government Association; the President of the Graduate Student Government or the President's graduate student designee; two representatives of the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs; and one representative each from the Graduate School and the Division of Administrative Affairs, the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Division of University Relations, and the Department of Resident Life.
- 6.12.b Quorum: A quorum of the Student Affairs Committee shall be twelve (12) voting members.
- 6.12.c Charge: The committee shall formulate and continually review policies regarding all non-academic matters of student life including, but not limited to, student organizations, resident life, extracurricular activities, and student concerns in the campus community.
- 6.12.d Charge: The committee shall assist the Office of the University Senate and the colleges and schools as appropriate in soliciting nominations and encouraging participation in the election of student Senators.

6.13 **Student Conduct Committee:**

- 6.13.a Membership: The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; four (4) faculty members; five (5) students, of whom at least three (3) must be undergraduate students and one (1) must be a graduate student; and the Director of the Office of Student Conduct, or a representative, as a non-voting consulting member.
- 6.13.b Charge: The committee shall formulate and continually review recommendations concerning the rules and codes of student conduct, as well as means of enforcing those rules and codes.
- 6.13.c Charge: The committee acts as an appellate body for infractions of the approved Codes of Student

Conduct and Code of Academic Integrity. Procedures for the committee's operation in this role are to be developed and filed with the Office of Student Conduct and the Executive Secretary and Director of the Senate. The committee shall also confirm members of all judicial boards listed in the Codes of Student Conduct, except conference and ad hoc boards.

ARTICLE 7 UNIVERSITY COUNCILS

- 7.1 **Definition:** University councils are established by Article 8.4 of the *Plan* to exercise an integrated advisory role over specified campus units and their associated activities. University councils are jointly sponsored by the University Senate, the College Park campus administration, and the chief administrative officer(s) of the designated unit(s) (hereafter indicated by "director"). University councils may be assigned reporting responsibilities to any member(s) of the College Park administration at the dean level or above (hereafter referred to as the "designated administrative officer").
- 7.2 **Creation of University Councils:** Proposals to create a University council shall be evaluated by a task force appointed jointly by the University Senate Executive Committee and the designated administrative officer to whom the new council would report. Following its deliberations, this task force shall present a report to the Senate, the designated administrative officer, and the director of the unit whose activities are the focus of the council. That report shall indicate the specifications that define the working relationship among the Senate, the designated administrative officer, and the director. The report shall include at least the following: the scope and purpose of the new council; a review of the current committees and advisory relationships to be superseded by the proposed council; identification of the designated administrative officer and unit director to whom the council reports; the charge to the council; the size, composition, and appointment process of members of the council; the council's relationship to the Senate, the designated administrative officer, and the director including the responsibilities of these three sponsors to the council and the responsibilities of the council to these three sponsors; and principles for operation of the council. The proposal of the task force shall be reviewed by the appropriate Senate committees, approved by the designated administrative officer, and then approved by the Senate. At the same time, the Senate shall approve appropriate revisions in its *Bylaws* to incorporate the council into its committee structure. The report of the task force, as approved, shall be preserved with official Senate documents, serving as a record of the original agreements establishing the council.
- 7.3 **Specifications in Senate Bylaws:** For each council, Senate bylaws shall: state its name; specify its responsibilities to the Senate; define its membership, including any voting privileges of ex officio members; and identify any exceptions or additions to the provisions of Article 7 of these *Bylaws* particular to the council.
- 7.4 **Basic Charge:**
- 7.4.a The council's responsibilities to the University Senate shall include those specified for Senate committees in Article 5.2 of these *Bylaws*. In addition, each council shall:
- (1) Sponsor hearings, as appropriate, on issues within its purview that are of concern to the Senate and the campus community.
 - (2) Provide a mechanism for communication with the campus community on major issues facing the unit and its activities.
 - (3) Respond to charges sent to the council by the Senate Executive Committee.
 - (4) Provide an annual written report to the Senate on the council's activities including the status of unresolved issues before the committee.
- 7.4.b Responsibilities to the designated administrative officer shall be specified in the Task Force Report and may include:
- (1) To advise on the unit's budget, space, and other material resources, in addition to personnel,

staffing and other human resources.

- (2) To advise on the unit's administrative policies and practices.
- (3) To advise on the charges to be given to periodic internal and external review committees.
- (4) To respond to requests for review, analysis, and advice from the designated administrative officer.
- (5) To meet at least annually with the designated administrative officer to review the major issues facing the unit and its activities on campus.
- (6) To fulfill such other responsibilities as specified in the Task Force Report.

7.4.c Responsibilities to the unit's director shall be specified in the Task Force Report and may include:

- (1) To advise on the needs and concerns of the campus community.
- (2) To advise on opportunities, policies, and practices related to the unit's ongoing operations.
- (3) To review and advise on unit reports, studies, and proposed initiatives.
- (4) To respond to requests for review, analysis, and advice made by the director.
- (5) To meet at least annually with the director to review the major issues facing the unit and its activities on campus.
- (6) To fulfill such other responsibilities as specified in the Task Force Report.

7.5 **Membership and Appointment to University Councils:**

- 7.5.a Membership: Councils shall have nine (nine) (9) to thirteen (13) members as specified in the appropriate subsection of Article 8 of these *Bylaws*. In addition, each council shall include an ex officio member designated by the administrative officer, and such other ex officio members as specified in the appropriate subsection of Article 5 of these *Bylaws*. These ex officio members shall have voice but no vote.
- 7.5.b Appointment: Representatives of the designated administrative officer's office and the Committee on Committees of the University Senate shall agree on nominees for vacancies on the council. These nominations shall be submitted to the designated administrative officer and to the University Senate for approval. In exercising its powers of appointment to the council, the Senate shall follow procedures for review and approval for Senate committee appointments specified in Article 5.5.d and 5.5.g of these *Bylaws*.
- 7.5.c Terms: Rules governing beginning date and length of terms, and restrictions on reappointment shall be those specified for Senate committees, except that the presiding officer shall serve a three (3) year term and cannot be reappointed.
- 7.5.d Appointment of Presiding Officer: The designated administrative officer and the Senate Executive Committee shall reach an agreement on a presiding officer, and the joint choice shall be submitted to the Senate for approval. If the presiding officer is selected from among the membership of the council, a replacement shall be appointed to the vacated seat.

7.6 **Operational Relationship of University Councils to Sponsors:**

- 7.6.a The University Senate Office shall support activities of the council in a manner similar to all other Senate committees.

- 7.6.b The office of the designated administrative officer, through its ex officio council member, shall provide liaison to other administrative units as required.
- 7.6.c The unit director shall provide the council with internal data, reports, studies, and any other materials required to support the council's work. In addition, the director shall also arrange for unit staff to appear before the committee as requested.
- 7.6.d Control of the University council's agenda shall be the responsibility of the presiding officer of the council and the voting members of the council, subject to the charges provided in Article 7.4 of these *Bylaws*, the appropriate subsection of Article 8 of these *Bylaws*, and the approved Task Force Report governing the council.
- 7.6.e Each University council shall develop its own bylaws which must be approved by the designated administrative officer and by the Senate.
- 7.6.f In addition to the required annual report, the presiding officer shall keep the Chair of the Senate informed of the major issues before the council and shall indicate when action or information items are likely to be forwarded for Senate consideration. In submitting recommendations for Senate action, the council shall inform the unit director and the designated administrative officer in advance of its recommendations. For purposes of conducting Senate business, reports from the University council and floor privileges of the Senate shall be managed in the same manner as general committees of the Senate defined in these *Bylaws* (3.3.c, 4.4.b, 4.7, and 5.3.a). In the case where the presiding officer of the University council is not a member of the Senate, he or she may report to the Senate and participate in the deliberations of the Senate subject to the provisions of Article 3.3.c of these *Bylaws*.

7.7 **Review of University Councils:**

- 7.7.a Five (5) years after a University council is formed, a review of the council shall be undertaken jointly by the Senate and administration, and a written report issued. The review may recommend continuation of the council in its original form and mode of operation, modification of the council structure and/or operations, or discontinuance of the council.
- 7.7.b Following the initial review, the University council and its operations shall be reviewed in conjunction with the periodic review of the *Plan*.

ARTICLE 8 UNIVERSITY COUNCIL SPECIFICATIONS

8.1 **University Library Council**

- 8.1.a **Charge:** The University Library Council has the responsibility to provide advice and to report on policy issues concerning the University Libraries to the University Senate, to the Senior Vice President and Provost, and to the Dean of Libraries. (See Appendix 2 for additional responsibilities and the Council's *Bylaws*).
- 8.1.b **Membership:** The Council shall consist of thirteen (13) appointed members and three (3) ex officio members. The appointed members shall be: the Chair, ten (10) other faculty members including at least one (1) member of the library faculty, a graduate student, and an undergraduate student. The three (3) ex officio members shall be a representative of the office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, a representative of the Office of the Dean of Libraries, and the Chair-Elect of the Senate.
- 8.1.c The Chair shall be a tenured faculty member.
- 8.1.d **Reporting Responsibilities:** The University Library Council shall report to the University Senate and the Senior Vice President and Provost under the terms of responsibility defined in Article 7.4 of these *Bylaws*.

8.2 **University Research Council:**

- 8.2.a Charge: In addition to the charges specified in Articles 5.2 and 7.4 of these *Bylaws*, the Council shall be governed by the following: The Council is charged to formulate and continually review policies regarding research, its funding, its relation to graduate and undergraduate academic degree programs, and its service to the community. Also, the Council is charged to review the research needs of faculty, other researchers and students, and to make recommendations to facilitate the research process and productivity of the University. Further, the Council shall formulate and continually review policies on the establishment, naming, reorganization, or abolition of bureaus, centers, or institutes that do not offer programs of instruction or regularly offer courses for credit, including their relationship to graduate and undergraduate academic programs. Additionally, when it perceives problems, the Council has the power to undertake investigative studies and recommend solutions.
- 8.2.b Membership: The University Research Council shall consist of thirteen (13) appointed members and ten (10) ex officio members. The appointed members shall be the Chair and eight (8) other faculty members; one (1) staff member; and three (3) students, including at least one (1) graduate and one (1) undergraduate student. The ten (10) ex officio members shall be a representative of the President (non-voting), a representative of the Senior Vice President and Provost (non-voting), a representative of the Vice President for Research, a representative of the Dean of the Graduate School, a representative of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Director of the Office of Research Administration and Advancement, and the Chairs of four (4) subcommittees of the University Research Council as follows: Research Development and Infrastructure Enhancement Subcommittee (RDIES); Research Advancement and Administration Subcommittee (TAAS); Intellectual Property and Economic Development Subcommittee (IPEDS); and Awards and Publicity Subcommittee (APS). The Chair shall be a tenured faculty member.
- 8.2.c Reporting Responsibilities: The University Research Council shall report to the University Senate and the Vice President for Research under the terms of responsibility defined in Article 7.4 of these *Bylaws* and the report establishing the University Research Council.

ARTICLE 9

DUTIES OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND DIRECTOR

- 9.1 The Executive Secretary and Director of the Senate shall be responsible for the minutes and audio recordings of all Senate meetings.
- 9.1.a The minutes shall include only actions and business transacted. They shall be submitted to the Senate for approval. Copies of the approved minutes shall be sent to all chief administrative officers of colleges, schools, departments, and other units, and to the campus news media.
- 9.1.b A complete audio recording shall be made of each meeting. An indexed copy of each audio recording, excluding only those parts recorded during closed sessions, shall be placed with the minutes in the University Archives for open access.
- 9.2 The Executive Secretary and Director shall also maintain the following kinds of Senate records (see Article 4.8):
- (1) All material distributed to Senate members;
 - (2) All material received by or distributed to members of the Executive Committee;
 - (3) Any minutes of the Senate or the Executive Committee not otherwise included under (1) and (2);
 - (4) Annual reports of all committees of the Senate not otherwise included under (1) and (2);
 - (5) The audio records of Senate meetings;
 - (6) The current and all previous versions of the *Plan* and the *Bylaws*;

- (7) Articles concerned with Senate structure and operation from campus and University publications as they come to the attention of the Executive Secretary and Director; and
 - (8) Other items deemed appropriate by the Executive Secretary and Director or the Chair of the Senate.
- 9.3 The Executive Secretary and Director shall store inactive records of the Senate in the University Archives.
 - 9.4 The Executive Secretary and Director shall be responsible for the preparation of the Senate budget in accordance with Article 4.6.
 - 9.5 The Executive Secretary and Director shall prepare as soon as possible after each annual senatorial election, a directory of the membership of the new Senate indicating for each member the constituency, term, office, local address, and telephone number. A copy of this directory shall be distributed to all members of the new Senate.
 - 9.6 The Executive Secretary and Director shall furnish all available information concerning the membership of the appropriate categories to each staff candidate nominated for election to the Senate.
 - 9.7 The Executive Secretary and Director shall keep a list, with campus addresses and telephone numbers, of all Senate officers and of all presiding officers of all Senate committees. This information shall be available upon request to any member of the campus community.
 - 9.8 The Executive Secretary and Director shall send to each Senator, by campus or electronic mail, a copy of the agenda and supporting material for each meeting. The receipt of the agenda and the supporting material then available shall satisfy the notice requirements of the meeting in question (Article 3.1 and 3.2.b).
 - 9.9 The Executive Secretary and Director shall prepare for the members of the Senate and its Executive Committee, as appropriate, all agendas, minutes, reports, and other documents, with the exception of proposals relating to the Programs, Curricula, and Courses (PCC) Committee. Nonetheless, the Executive Secretary and Director shall be responsible for the distribution of all items of Senate business, including PCC items to the members of the Senate and its Executive Committee, and to other such committees as necessary.
 - 9.10 The Executive Secretary and Director shall inform the Executive Committee of the status of all members of the Senate in accordance with the *Plan* (Article 3.4.a(4-5), 3.4.b(4-5), and 3.7) and these *Bylaws* (Articles 2.2, 4.1, 5.5, and 5.6).
 - 9.11 The Executive Secretary and Director shall have the privilege of attending the meetings of all standing committees and ad hoc committees of the Senate to assist in the coordination of Senate business.
 - 9.12 The Executive Secretary and Director, as the Senate's representative, shall provide information or assistance as requested to the committee for revision of the undergraduate catalog.

ARTICLE 10

ANNUAL TRANSITION OF THE SENATE

10.1 **Preparation for Transition:**

- 10.1.a By no later than the scheduled December meeting of the Senate, the Committee on Committees shall present to the Senate at least eight (8) nominees from among outgoing Senate members to serve on the Nominations Committee. The nominees shall include four (4) faculty members, one (1) exempt staff member, one (1) non-exempt staff member, one (1) graduate student, and one (1) undergraduate student. Further nominations shall be accepted from the floor of the Senate. The Senate, as a body, shall elect four (4) faculty members, one (1) exempt staff member, one (1) non-exempt staff member, one (1) graduate student, and one (1) undergraduate to serve as the

Nominations Committee. The Chair-elect of the Senate shall serve as a non-voting, ex officio member of the Nominations Committee. The Nominations Committee shall elect its own Chair. The Nominations Committee shall solicit nominations from the membership of the Senate and shall present to the Chair of the Senate by April 1:

- (1) A slate of at least two (2) candidates per seat from each constituency for elected membership on the Executive Committee, including those incumbent elected members who are eligible and willing to stand for reelection,
- (2) Slates of candidates to replace the outgoing members of the Committee on Committees and such other committees as required by these *Bylaws*, including at least one (1) nominee for each position to be filled, and
- (3) A minimum of two (2) candidates for the office of Chair-Elect.

Before reporting to the Chair of the Senate, the nominating committee shall secure the consent of all nominees in writing.

- 10.1.b. A brief statement of each candidate's qualifications shall be sent to the voting membership of the incoming Senate a minimum of twenty (20) calendar days before the Transitional Meeting of the Senate. Any further nominations made by members of the Senate and accompanied by a brief supporting statement and the consent of the candidate must be received by the Executive Secretary and Director at least twelve (12) working days before the Transitional Meeting. These additional nominations shall be mailed to the membership of the incoming Senate at least ten (10) working days before the Transitional Meeting.

10.2 Transitional Meeting:

- 10.2.a The Transitional Meeting will be the last regularly scheduled meeting of the Spring semester, and starts a new Senate session.
- 10.2.b Terms of office of newly elected Senators will begin, and the terms of the outgoing Senators will end, with the call to order of the transitional meeting by the outgoing Chair.
- 10.2.c Election of the Chair-Elect, as provided for in section 5.5.a of the *Plan*, shall be the first order of business of the Transitional Meeting, after which the outgoing Chair will pass the gavel to the previous Chair-Elect, who will assume the Chair.
- 10.2.d The election of the Executive Committee and the election of incoming members of the Committee on Committees, and such other persons elected by the members of the Senate as prescribed in these *Bylaws*, shall be scheduled special orders of the Transitional Meeting. Nominations may be received from the floor by the Chair, in addition to those provided for in Article 10.1. Any such nomination is contingent on the consent of the candidate, which must have been secured beforehand in writing if the nomination is made in the absence of the candidate. In the event of a tie vote in the election for members of the Executive Committee or the Committee on Committees, a ballot will be mailed to each Senator in the appropriate constituency. Ballots are to be returned to the Senate Office within one (1) week from the date mailed.
- 10.2.e The elected members of the outgoing Executive Committee and the Committee on Committees shall continue to serve until the election of new members is held.
- 10.2.f After the conclusion of the Transitional Meeting, any remaining vacancies on standing committees will be filled on an acting basis by the new Committee on Committees, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee and pending confirmation by the full Senate at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

APPENDIX 1 COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS AND TERMS

Implementation Procedures

Amended March 8, 2012

In the initial year [1994-95] of implementation of Section 5.5, the following provisions shall govern appointment of members eligible for appointment to two-year terms:

- (1) Half of the members shall be appointed to the committee for a one-year term and half for a two-year term.
- (2) When multiple members are selected for a committee from a particular constituency, half shall be appointed for one-year terms and half for two-year terms.
- (3) Incumbent committee members may be re-appointed to their committees for a one-year term, as long as their serving the one-year term does not extend their service beyond the length of service specified in Sections 5.5.e and 5.5.f.
- (4) In preparing their slate for Senate action, the Committee on Committees shall identify one-year nominees and two-year nominees. The Senate may change the length of term of any nominee as long as such changes do not violate provisions of the *Plan* and *Bylaws*.

APPENDIX 2 BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COUNCIL

1. **Charge to the Council:** The University Library Council has the responsibility to provide advice about policy issues concerning the University Libraries to the University Senate, to the Senior Vice President and Provost, and to the Dean of Libraries.

A. The Council's Responsibilities to the University Senate:

- (1) Make recommendations for major changes and improvements in policies, operations, and services of the Libraries that represent the concerns and interests of Senate constituencies as well as other users of the Libraries. Such recommendations should specify the resource implications. Reports and recommendations to the University Senate shall be submitted to the Senate Executive Committee for placement on the agenda of the University Senate in the same manner as reports from the Senate's general committees. It is expected that the Council will also inform the Senior Vice President and Provost in advance of these legislative recommendations. In addition to the mandatory annual report, the Chair of the Council shall keep the Chair of the Senate informed of the major issues before the Council and shall indicate when action or information items are likely to be forwarded for Senate consideration.
- (2) Respond to charges sent to the Council by the Senate Executive Committee.
- (3) Provide an annual written report of the Council's activities, including the status of recommendations made by the Council each year, and of unresolved issues before the Council.

B. The Council's Responsibilities to the Senior Vice President and Provost:

- (1) Advise on the Libraries' budget, space, personnel and staffing, and other resources. It is expected that the Senior Vice President and Provost will consult the Council before undertaking major reviews of the Libraries with APAC and before preparing the annual budget for the Libraries.
- (2) Advise on the Libraries' administrative policies and practices.
- (3) Advise on the charges to be given to the committees to review the Dean of Libraries and to conduct the unit review of the University Libraries based on University policy
- (4) Advise on matters concerning the Libraries in conjunction with accreditation review and strategic planning.
- (5) Respond to requests for review, analysis, and advice made by the Senior Vice President and Provost.
- (6) Meet at least annually with the Senior Vice President and Provost to review the major issues facing the Libraries and its activities on campus.

- (7) The Council is responsible for informing the Senior Vice President and Provost of pending reports and recommendations to the University Senate.

C. The Council's Responsibilities to the Dean of Libraries:

- (1) Advise on the needs and concerns of diverse constituencies within the campus community with respect to Library policies, services, and new resources and technology.
- (2) Advise on strategies to involve Library users in the initiation, evaluation, and integration of new Library policies, practices, procedures, and technology. Such strategies might include forums for the discussion of changes, workshops for adjusting to new technologies, and ongoing programs of Library education.
- (3) Advise on operations, policies and new opportunities.
- (4) Advise on Library planning including strategic planning and other major plans for Library operation and development.
- (5) Review and advise on the Libraries' reports, studies, and proposed initiatives that have significant long-term resource implications for the Libraries.
- (6) Hold at least one (1) meeting each year at which the Dean shall review major issues and plans, summarized in a State of the Libraries report distributed in advance to the Council.
- (7) It is expected that the Council will adopt a broad campus perspective and that the Dean of the Libraries will inform the Council of the University Libraries' needs and concerns and seek advice about major modifications of policies and operations affecting the campus community.

D. To Fulfill Its Responsibilities, the Council May:

- (1) Undertake investigative studies in matters concerning the University Libraries and recommend solutions to the University Senate, the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Dean of Libraries, or the general campus community.
- (2) Conduct open hearings on major issues concerning the University Libraries and their activities.
- (3) Communicate directly with the campus community on concerns related to support for, policies of, and services provided by the University Libraries.

2. **Composition of the Council:** The Council shall consist of thirteen (13) appointed members and three (3) ex officio members. The appointed members shall be: the Chair, ten (10) other faculty members including at least one (1) member of the Library faculty, a graduate student, and an undergraduate student. The three (3) ex officio members shall be a representative of the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, a representative of the Dean of the Libraries Office, and the Chair-Elect of the Senate.

A. Tenure in Office:

- (1) The Council Chair should be a tenured faculty member appointed for a single three-year term. Normally, the Chair shall have served as a member of the Council. If the Chair is serving as a regular member of the Council at the time of appointment, a new member shall be appointed to serve the remainder of the term the Chair has vacated. The Senior Vice President and Provost and the Senate Executive Committee shall reach an agreement on the Council Chair, and the joint choice shall be submitted to the University Senate for its approval.
- (2) The remaining ten (10) faculty members shall be appointed for staggered two-year terms. No faculty member shall serve more than two (2) terms consecutively. For this purpose, members who have served more than a year should be considered to have served a full term.
- (3) The two (2) student members shall be appointed for one-year terms. No student member should serve more than two (2) terms consecutively. For this purpose, student members who have served more than

half their term should be considered to have served a full term.

- (4) The Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost will appoint a member of the Provost's staff as an ex officio member of the Council who will have voice but not vote.
- (5) The Dean of Libraries' Office will appoint an upper-level member of the Libraries' administrative staff as an ex officio member of the Council who will have voice but no vote.
- (6) The Chair-Elect of the Senate shall serve as an ex officio member of the Council who will have voice but no vote.

B. Qualifications of Council Members: Successful operation of the Council requires that the members of the Council understand the nature of the Libraries and represent the best interests of the campus as well as the particular interests of their specific constituencies.

- 1. The Council members should be chosen from people who can bring a campus-wide perspective to their deliberations on Library matters and who have shown interest and willingness to foster a good working relationship between the Libraries and their users.
- 2. Council members should be selected to represent as broad a range of campus disciplines and interests as possible. Faculty members should include representatives from both the professional and arts and sciences colleges, and within these constituencies, representatives of the arts and humanities, social sciences, and physical and biological sciences.

C. The Appointment Process: In the spring of each year, the Chair of the University Library Council shall notify the representative of the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Chair-Elect of the Senate of the appointments required for the following academic year. The representative of the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Chair-Elect of the Senate shall draw up a slate of committee members who will agree to serve, and the slate will be submitted to the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Committee on Committees for approval. The list of nominees for Council membership shall be submitted to the University Senate for approval. Ordinarily, the slate will be presented at the same Senate meeting at which other committee slates are approved. Dates of appointment and beginning of terms shall correspond with those of Senate committees. Replacement of Council members will take place through the same consultative process as the initial appointment, with submission of names to the Senate occurring as needed.

3. Operation of the Council: Effective and efficient Council operation will require adequate support and full cooperation among the Senate, the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Dean, and their offices.

- A. The University Senate Office or its designee will provide normal committee support to the Council, including maintaining mailing lists, reproducing Council documents, keeping a copy of Council minutes, maintaining files for the Council, and arranging meeting rooms.
- B. The Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, through its ex officio Council member, will provide liaison to other administrative units, such as the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment, for their reports, data, or assistance. The Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost will also provide website space for the Council.
- C. The Dean of the Libraries will provide the Council with internal data, reports, studies, etc. as needed to support the Council's work. The Dean will also arrange for unit staff to present testimony concerning such reports as the Council finds useful in carrying out its responsibilities. The Dean's assistance to the committee shall also include providing the Council members with the opportunity to attend an appropriate orientation session dealing with the Libraries.
- D. Control of the Council's agenda will be the responsibility of the Council Chair and the voting members of the Council.
- E. While being responsive to the needs of the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Senate in a timely manner is necessary, the sponsoring parties and the Dean of the Libraries must not attempt to micro-manage the ongoing operation of the Council. In turn the Council must not attempt to micro manage the Libraries.

- F. The Council shall meet as necessary, but in no case less than once per semester. Meetings may be called by the Chair. In addition, upon receiving a request of any three members of the Council, the Chair shall call a meeting. A majority of the voting members of the Council shall constitute a quorum for the conducting of official business of the Council.

4. Operational Relationship of the Council to its Sponsors:

- A. For purposes of University Senate action, a Council created through Senate action will appear in essentially the same role as a general committee of the University Senate.
- B. The Chair may present reports and recommendations to the Senate but will not have a vote in Senate proceedings, unless he or she is a member of the Senate.
- C. Since the committees of the Senior Vice President and Provost range widely in form and function, and do not operate under a formal plan of organization and bylaws, there is no need to specify the Council's standing in the same fashion. For other purposes, such as APAC review of the Unit, the Council might be consulted like a College Advisory Council (that colleges will have under the shared governance plan) could be.
- D. The Dean of Libraries will ordinarily meet with the Council and have a voice in its deliberations. Since one of the three main functions of the Council is to advise the Dean, the Dean shall not formally be a member of the Council. On formal reports and recommendations of the Council to the University Senate or to the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Dean of the Libraries may send a separate memorandum to the Senate or the Senior Vice President and Provost, as appropriate, supporting or opposing the report or the recommendations, and providing the rationale for the Dean's position.
5. **Review of the Council:** The Council and its operations will be reviewed in conjunction with the periodic review of the Senate and the *Plan*.

**APPENDIX 3
PROCEDURES FOR ELECTIONS OF UMCP REPRESENTATIVES TO THE
COUNCIL OF UNIVERSITY SYSTEM FACULTY (CUSF)**

The Chair of CUSF is not a member of CUSF. Thus, if the Chair is from College Park, a replacement must be named. At the end of his/her term as Chair, if his/her term on CUSF is not finished, he/she resumes his/her position as a CUSF member.

The normal term for CUSF representatives is three (3) years, with two alternates serving three (3) – year terms; if both alternates are elected at the same time, priority to be a replacement shall be in order of votes received; if a regular representative is unable to serve out his/her term, an alternate replaces him/her for the remainder of the term, and a new alternate is named. The replacement representative shall be chosen in order of number of votes received. The Nominations Committee will select a replacement alternate subject to confirmation by the Senate.

The University Senate, in accordance with its usual procedures, will elect representatives to CUSF in the spring. Faculty members only are entitled to vote. Each faculty Senate member has as many votes as there are open positions. If there are more candidates than positions, the person(s) receiving the most votes, in order, are declared representatives. The person receiving the next most votes is declared alternate. The remaining person, in order of vote tally, will be asked to move into the alternate position if the previous paragraph comes in to play. A record of the outcome of the election will be retained by the Executive Secretary and Director of the University Senate. If there are not sufficient candidates, or the pool of candidates is exhausted, representatives are chosen by the Executive Committee.

Dates of Approval, Updates and Amendments to the Senate Bylaws

(Approved, Campus Senate, October 9, 1986)
 (Approved, Board of Regents, February 6, 1987)
 (Updated, July 11, 1988)
 (Amended, February 13, 1986)
 (Amended, December 7, 1986)
 (Amended, May 7, 1990)
 (Amended, September 13, 1990)
 (Amended, November 15, 1990)
 (Amended, October 14, 1993)
 (Amended, December 6, 1993)
 (Amended, March 31, 1994)
 (Amended, April 18, 1994)
 (Amended, May 5, 1994)
 (Amended, November 10, 1994)
 (Amended, August 28, 1996)
 (Amended, May 15, 1997)
 (Amended, March 5, 1998)
 (Amended, April 2, 1998)

(Amended, April 6, 2000)
 (Amended, February 12, 2001)
 (Amended, September 19, 2002)
 (Amended, February 3, 2003)
 (Amended, October 16, 2003)
 (Amended, April 19, 2004)
 (Amended, April 4, 2005)
 (Amended, May 15, 2007)
 (Amended, May 8, 2008)
 (Amended, October 16, 2008)
 (Amended, February 9, 2009)
 (Amended, May 4, 2009)
 (Amended, November 12, 2009)
 (Amended, March 3, 2010)
 (Amended, February 9, 2011)
 (Amended, May 4, 2011)
 (Amended, March 8, 2012)



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	11-12-12
Title:	Proposal to Change the Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) Operating Procedure
Presenter:	Rachel Cooper, Chair, Senate Student Affairs Committee
Date of SEC Review:	April 5, 2012
Date of Senate Review:	April 19, 2012
Voting (highlight one):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	<p>The Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) was created by President Mote to give students an opportunity to be involved with the proposal and evaluation of student fees at the University of Maryland. At the time, UMCP was the only University System of Maryland (USM) school to have such a committee. Since 2008, this committee has evaluated fees on a bi-annual basis, evaluating mandatory fees in the fall and non-mandatory fees in the winter/spring.</p> <p>In fall 2011, Student Government Association (SGA) President Kaiyi Xie and Graduate Student Government (GSG) President Anna Bedford submitted a proposal to the University Senate requesting a review of the Committee on the Review of Student Fees, highlighting various concerns with lack of student involvement and accountability within the student-fee review process.</p> <p>The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Student Affairs Committee on October 27, 2011, with reviewing the proposal and advising on whether the current operating procedure is appropriate.</p>
Relevant Policy # & URL:	UMCP Policy on the Review & Approval of Student Fees (no policy number or URL listed)
Recommendation:	<p>The Senate Student Affairs Committee approved the following recommendations to the operating procedures of the CRSF.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All units must appear annually before the CRSF and provide justification for their unit's student fees. 2. All fee proposals must be vetted by a representative group of constituents and should include a description of that advisory

	<p>group.</p> <p>3. All fee proposals should include a discussion of fee changes and a report of how enhancements were used in the prior year.</p>
Committee Work:	<p>The Student Affairs Committee (SAC) initially consulted with co-proposer Kaiyi Xie, an ex-officio member of SAC, to gain perspective his concerns with the current operating procedures of the CRSF. After reviewing both the University System of Maryland and University of Maryland College Park policies regarding student fees, the committee met with Robert Specter, Vice President for Administrative Affairs, Robert Platky, Assistant Vice President and Director of the Office of Budget & Fiscal Analysis, and Ann Wylie, Senior Vice President and Provost, to gain a better perspective of the fee review process, the history behind why the committee was created by President Mote, and its role as an advisory body to the President of the University. In addition, Specter and Platky informed the SAC of recent changes to the operating procedures of the CRSF.</p> <p>The committee also met with the proposers, Kaiyi Xie and Anna Bedford to discuss their specific concerns and the recent administrative changes to the student-fee review process and evaluate the elements of the proposal that they felt still needed to be addressed.</p> <p>The SAC reviewed the peer institution student-fee review policies and analyzed the various data collected. The SAC was in agreement that administrative changes should be made to make the student-fee review process more inclusive of students during the unit-level review process and require units to be accountable for their fee proposals and how enhancements were used. The committee also agreed to share the best practices of some exemplary fee-requesting units as an appendix to its report. The SAC met on March 5, 2012 and approved three recommendations to the operating procedures of the CRSF.</p>
Alternatives:	The Senate could reject the proposed changes and the current procedures would remain.
Risks:	If the Senate does not approve the proposed changes, the University could miss an opportunity to increase student involvement in the fee review process.
Financial Implications:	There are no financial implications associated with the proposed changes.
Further Approvals Required:	Senate Approval, Presidential Approval

Senate Student Affairs Committee

Senate Document 11-12-12

Proposal to Change Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF)

March 2011

BACKGROUND:

The Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) was created by President Mote to give students an opportunity to be involved with the proposal and evaluation of student fees at the University of Maryland. At the time, UMCP was the only University System of Maryland (USM) school to have such a committee. Since 2008, this committee has evaluated fees on a bi-annual basis, evaluating mandatory fees in the fall and non-mandatory fees in the winter/spring.

Currently, the CRSF consists of six student members (4 undergraduate, 2 graduate), two faculty or staff members, one senator, three voting ex-officios (Vice President for Student Affairs, Dean for Undergraduate Studies, and Dean of the Graduate School), and an appointed Chair. The Vice President for Administrative Affairs, as appointed by the President of the University, traditionally serves as the Chair of the Committee, as this individual has no student fees generated by his or her office. Student members serve a one-year term that coincides with the term of the appointing authority. Faculty and staff members serve two-year staggered terms based on an academic year.

In fall 2011, Student Government Association (SGA) President Kaiyi Xie and Graduate Student Government (GSG) President Anna Bedford submitted a proposal to the University Senate requesting a review of the Committee on the Review of Student Fees, highlighting various concerns with lack of student involvement and accountability within the student-fee review process. Following a review by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) in October 2011, the proposal was charged to the Student Affairs Committee of the University Senate for further review and evaluation.

CURRENT PRACTICE:

Prior to the proposal from Presidents Xie and Bedford, the Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) did not actively enforce the policy that representatives from a unit appear before the committee during the fee review process regardless of whether the unit was requesting a fee increase. The CRSF also did not have guidelines requiring that proposals provide detailed information regarding a budget breakdown, past spending, or student involvement. Lastly, the proposal states that the CRSF takes sparse minutes, making it difficult for new members to review past decisions.

Vice President for Administrative Affairs, Robert Specter and Assistant Vice President & Director of the Office of Budget & Fiscal Analysis, Robert Platky explained that the CRSF had already made several administrative changes that would address some of the issues raised by Presidents Xie and Bedford (Appendix 4). Specifically, all fee requesting units would be required

to meet with the CRSF on an annual basis, regardless of whether they were requesting an increase in their fee or not. In addition, units would have to submit a description of student involvement in the fee proposal review process. These new requirements would be enforced during the 2012 winter/spring non-mandatory fee cycle. They also noted that the CRSF has adopted Robert's Rules for small committees and its guidelines for minutes. In addition, they have set a new policy that members of the CRSF would receive materials two weeks prior to each meeting.

COMMITTEE WORK:

The Senate Student Affairs Committee (SAC) was charged (Appendix 1) by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) with reviewing the proposal, "Proposal to Change Committee on the Review of Student Fees" on October 27, 2011 (Appendix 2). The SEC asked the SAC to review the proposal and advise on whether the current operating procedure is appropriate.

The SEC charged the SAC with consulting with the bill's proposers, Vice President for Administrative Affairs, Rob Specter, Michele Eastman, Assistant President and Chief of Staff, and the University's Office of Legal Affairs. In addition, the committee was charged with reviewing the UMCP Policy on the Review and Approval of Student Fees (Appendix 3), the USM Board of Regents Policy on Student Tuition, Fees, and Charges (VIII-2.50), and similar policies at peer institutions.

The SAC consulted with Kaiyi Xie, one of the bill's proposers and an ex-officio member of the committee, to better understand his concerns with the current operating procedures of the CRSF. The SAC also reviewed the UMCP Policy on the Review and Approval of Student Fees and discussed whether amendments to the policy were necessary.

The SAC met with Robert Specter, Vice President for Administrative Affairs, Robert Platky, Assistant Vice President and Director of the Office of Budget & Fiscal Analysis, and Ann Wylie, Senior Vice President and Provost, to gain a better perspective of both the structure of the CRSF, the history behind why the committee was created by President Mote, and its role as an advisory body to the President of the University. Michele Eastman requested that Provost Wylie speak on her behalf since she was Assistant President and Chief of Staff at the time the CRSF was created. At this meeting, Vice President Specter and Assistant Vice President Platky gave the SAC an overview of the fee review process and informed them of the recent changes to the operating procedures of the CRSF.

The SAC reviewed the USM Board of Regents Policy on Student Tuition, Fees, and Charges (VIII-2.50), which outlines the University's authority over setting student fees. The committee also met with the proposers, Anna Bedford and Kaiyi Xie, to discuss their specific concerns and the recent administrative changes to the student-fee review process, and to evaluate the elements of the proposal that they felt still needed to be addressed.

The SAC discussed the various issues raised in the proposal including whether the Chair of the CRSF should be elected or appointed, member terms, the review timeline, the contents of fee proposals, and the composition of the unit-level advisory groups. The committee also discussed whether fee proposals should include an update of previously approved enhancement requests.

Transparency of the review process including the content of the CRSF minutes and the openness of CRSF meetings were also discussed.

The SAC reviewed the peer institution student-fee review data. This analysis reviewed four of the University's peer institutions to better understand the composition of their student fee review committees. While many of the policies differed, the University of California, Los Angeles used a 2-year staggered term policy for student members of the committee.

After reviewing the peer policies and analyzing the various data collected, the committee considered possible recommendations. The SAC was in agreement that administrative changes should be made to make the student-fee review process more inclusive of students during the unit-level review process and require units to be accountable for their fee proposals and how enhancements were used. The committee also agreed to share the best practices of some exemplary fee-requesting units as an appendix to its report. (Appendix 5) Ultimately, the SAC approved three recommendations to the operating procedures of the CRSF.

RECOMMENDATIONS

At its meeting on March 5, 2012, the Student Affairs Committee voted in favor of forwarding the following recommendations to the operating procedures of the CRSF.

1. All units must appear annually before the CRSF and provide justification for their unit's student fees.
2. All fee proposals must be vetted by a representative group of constituents and should include a description of that advisory group.
3. All fee proposals should include a discussion of fee changes and a report of how enhancements were used in the prior year.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Charge from the Senate Executive Committee, October 27, 2011

Appendix 2 – Proposal to Change the Committee on the Review of Student Fees


Appendix 3 – UMCP Policy on the Review and Approval of Student Fees

Appendix 4 – Updated Procedures of the Committee on the Review of Student Fees

Appendix 5 – Best Practices of Fee-Requesting Units



**University Senate
CHARGE**

Date:	October 27, 2011
To:	Rachel Cooper Chair, Student Affairs Committee
From:	Eric Kasischke Chair, University Senate 
Subject:	Proposal to Change Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) Operating Procedure
Senate Document #:	11-12-12
Deadline:	March 30, 2012

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) requests that the Student Affairs Committee review the attached proposal entitled, “Proposal to Change Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) Operating Procedure” and make recommendations on whether the CRSF operating procedures should be revised.

President C.D. Mote Jr. created the CRSF as a means to obtain student input during the process of assessing student fees. The University’s official policy on the Review and Approval of Student Fees outlines the authority for setting fees, the process for student participation, and the membership of the committee. The SEC requests that the Student Affairs Committee review the proposal and advise on whether the current operating procedure is appropriate.

Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Review the UMCP Policy on the Review and Approval of Student Fees.
2. Review the USM Board of Regents Policy on Student Tuition, Fees, and Charges (VIII-2.50).
3. Meet with the Vice President for Administrative Affairs, Robert Spector, or his representative to obtain an overview of the procedures utilized by the CRSF including overall timeline for its work, accountability, and transparency of the review process.
4. Meet with Michele Eastman, Assistant President & Chief of Staff, to obtain an overview of the CRSF’s advisory responsibilities to the President of the University.

5. Consult with the proposers to discuss their specific concerns about the current operating procedure of the CRSF.
6. Consult with the University's Office of Legal Affairs.
7. If appropriate, recommend how the current procedures could be revised.

We ask that you submit your report and recommendations to the Senate Office no later than March 30, 2012. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.



University Senate PROPOSAL FORM

Name:	Anna Bedford, GSG President, Ex-officio senator Kaiyi Xie, SGA President, Ex-officio senator
Date:	
Title of Proposal:	Proposal to change CRSF (Committee on the Review of Student Fees) operating procedure
Phone Number:	
Email Address:	
Campus Address:	
Unit/Department/College:	ARHU, ENGR/CMNS
Constituency (faculty, staff, undergraduate, graduate):	Graduate & Undergraduate
Description of issue/concern/policy in question:	<p>CRSF is currently an advisory body with purview over changes to student fees made up of 4 undergraduate students, 2 graduate students, and 7 faculty/staff (including chair). However, there are serious flaws within the operating structure. There is a severe lack of transparency and accountability that contravenes the values of shared governance the University of Maryland and the Senate holds dear. Deliberations are all held in private, the committee is not given any way to track how student fees are being used once they have been approved, the committee cannot reduce or amend any fee proposal, even if the unit has failed to do as the committee required, and there are no clear guidelines on the amount of authority given to the committee. In addition, the chair is not an elected position within the committee but maintains a right to vote when it will make a difference. It is difficult to have a sense of the full history of the committee, because records are not well kept, however, we believe the chair has had reason to vote on several occasions, but has never voted with the majority of students. For this reason the committee is effectively constituted with a minority of student votes.</p>
Description of action/changes you would like to see implemented and why:	<p><i>Transparency</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members of the committee ought be given adequate time to prepare and research the proposals. Last year they were given only 2-3 days with the binders before the meeting, which was not enough time to study the proposals or to share with their constituencies. - Detailed meeting minutes ought be made available to all members of the University community. Currently, only vote tallies are kept

	<p>without any describing substance or context of the discussion during which the votes took place. This is particularly important for the student members who often rotate off after a year and will not have access to the history of fee discussions, such as the stated purpose for which a new fee was created.</p> <p><i>Accountability</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Each division requesting any student fees ought set up an open and transparent student advisory board that is inclusive of many different constituencies and campus governing bodies that oversees the fee proposal before it reaches CRSF. This is a policy of the CRSF but it is not enforced and several units, including Athletics, the Health Center, and Nyumburu are allowed to levy fees without giving affected constituencies a chance for input. - The committee ought be able to see how the previous year's student fee in a particular unit/department was spent and if it was consistent with the manner in which the fee was proposed to be spent. - The committee should have clearly stated guidelines in which its authority and purview is clarified, and then made available to the campus community. - The committee should have the power to elect its own chair in order to make the process more fair and equitable
<p>Suggestions for how your proposal could be put into practice:</p>	<p>All the proposed changes are fairly simple to make and do not require heavy investments of time but simply a procedural change to how the committee is being conducted now. In addition, there are no foreseeable financial impacts of these changes being proposed.</p>
<p>Additional Information:</p>	

Please send your completed form and any supporting documents to senate-admin@umd.edu or University of Maryland Senate Office, 1100 Marie Mount Hall, College Park, MD 20742-7541. Thank you!

UMCP Policies

Policy on the Review and Approval of Student Fees

The purpose of this policy is to establish a procedure whereby students have an appropriate advisory role in the recommendation of student fees. Student participation is accommodated to ensure full disclosure on the appropriateness of the student fee schedule, the need for specific fees, and the cost-benefit of the fees to the student community. This participation carries with it the expectation that the process will be collaborative with broad involvement and representation and result in appropriate information sharing with the community at large.

Authority for Setting Fees

Mandatory fees and room, board and parking charges are set by the Board of Regents of the University System of Maryland (USM) as stipulated in the Policy on Student Tuition, Fees and Charges (262.0, VIII-2.50) approved by the Board of Regents, June 21, 1990.

The management of student fees, including the review and recommendation of proposed fees and the authorization of expenditures from the resulting fee revenues, is the responsibility of the President, who is advised by the President's Cabinet. The Cabinet is advised by the Committee for the Review of Student Fees (CRSF) on recommendations for proposed fees.

Process for Student Participation

Mandatory fees and room, board and parking charges will undergo a five-step process:

- (1) The unit proposing the fee provides an opportunity to the affected student constituency for discussion on the merits and impact of the fee.
- (2) The Committee for the Review of Student Fees reviews the proposed fee and makes a recommendation to the Cabinet.
- (3) The Cabinet reviews the fee proposal and the recommendation made by the Committee to Review Student Fees and make a recommendation to the President.
- (4) The President recommends the fee schedule to the USM Board of Regents.
- (5) Board of Regents approves the fees.

In the event that actions by the State or Board of Regents with fiscal implications to the operations funded by the fees occur late in the process, it may be necessary that the fee submission be modified by the President.

Committee for the Review of Student Fees

The Committee for the Review of Student Fees shall be comprised of thirteen individuals.

Members

Appointing Authority

Chair	President of the University
Vice President Student Affairs	Ex officio, voting
Dean, Undergraduate Studies	Ex officio, voting
Dean, Graduate School	Ex officio, voting
4 undergraduate students	President of the Student Government Association
2 graduate students	President of the Graduate Student Government
2 faculty or staff	President of the University
1 Senator	Chair of the University Senate

Normally the Chair is the Vice President for Administrative Affairs. Student members serve a one-year term that coincides with the term of the appointing authority. Faculty and staff members serve two-year staggered terms based on an academic year.

Approved by the President on 10/24/08



UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

DEPARTMENT OF BUDGET AND FISCAL ANALYSIS

2132 Main Administration Building
College Park, Maryland 20742-5035
301.405.5627 TEL 301.314.9519 FAX

MEMO TO: Fee-Proposing Unit Representatives

FROM: Robert A. Platky
Director of Budget & Fiscal Analysis

SUBJECT: Follow-Up to Fall 2011 Mandatory Student Fee Review Process

DATE: November 30, 2011

Attached for your information is a copy of the final draft of the minutes of the September 23, 2011, meeting of the Committee for the Review of Student Fees. The Cabinet and President subsequently endorsed the Committee's recommendations and the fee proposals have been forwarded to USM for approval by the Board of Regents.

As further follow-up to this fall's Mandatory Student Fees recommendation process, the Committee provides the following additional guidance to fee-proposing units ("proposers"):

1) Regardless of the amount of the fee proposal, including those that are unchanged, proposers *must* provide a complete and accurate fee proposal to the Committee. Proposers should submit all required data schedules and ensure that the information is complete and ties to FRS data; this is especially important because the Budget & Fiscal Analysis staff has only a few days following the due date to compile the various fee proposals and prepare the materials for distribution to the Committee.

2) Current policy requires that "the unit proposing the fee provide an opportunity to the affected student constituency for discussion on the merits and impact of the fee" (Policy, Process for Student Participation, (1)). To ensure that student stakeholders are robustly engaged, proposers will from now on be required to include in their fee proposal a clear description of the student consultation process. It should include how students are selected for involvement, how many students are engaged and the character of the discussions.

3) Regardless of the amount of the fee proposal, including those that are unchanged, proposers *must* attend or have representation at Committee meeting(s) to present the proposal and to respond to questions and concerns of the Committee. Proposers should be prepared to respond to questions about the use of fee proceeds, necessity for a change in the amount of the fee (if any), and the portion of the program/activity expense that is partially or fully fee supported.

Your assistance in ensuring a thorough and meaningful review and approval process for student fees is very much appreciated. Please let either committee chairman Rob Specter or me know if you have any questions or concerns regarding this guidance.

cc: Committee Members

APPENDIX 5

BEST PRACTICES OF FEE-REQUESTING UNITS

The Student Affairs Committee discussed the review processes of several fee-requesting units at the University. The committee noted that broad representation of the student body on the unit-level advisory committees, inclusive of graduate and undergraduate students, was an important element of the review process. Units that do not have an existing structure of student groups (i.e. RHA, CTAC) to populate their advisory groups could use the Graduate Student Government (GSG) and Student Government Association (SGA) to assist them in forming their unit-level review committees. The Presidents of these organizations can be contacted at gsg-president@umd.edu or SGApresident@umd.edu. In addition, the committee noted that some units provided more detailed overall budget information in their fee proposals.

The committee offers the following best practices of some of the University's fee-requesting units as a guide for other units:

Mandatory Fees Summary

CAMPUS RECREATION – Fees are reviewed by the Campus Recreation Advisory Board, which includes representatives from the Student Government Association (SGA), Graduate Student Government (GSG), Residence Hall Association (RHA), Off Campus Student Association, and the student appointee from the Vice President of Student Affairs. Individual meetings are also held with the SGA and GSG presidents.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICES (DOTS) (SHUTTLE) – Meetings are held individually with SGA, GSG and RHA leaders. Fees are then reviewed by the Campus Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), which includes representation from SGA and GSG.

THE ADELE H. STAMP STUDENT UNION, UNDERGRAD STUDENT ACTIVITIES, GRAD STUDENT ACTIVITIES – The Center for Campus Life has a Stamp Advisory Board serving as its oversight group. This group approves the annual budget and also reviews and approves any fee increases. It is also the group that reviews our policies and services (including approving any new policies, building vendors, or major building changes). The Stamp Advisory Board meets bi-weekly and has voting, non-voting, and ex-officio members. The voting membership includes students, alumni, faculty, staff, ex-officio staff. The majority of the members of this board are students that are appointed by the Student Government Association (SGA), Graduate Student Government (GSG), and Student Entertainment Events (SEE), in addition to several at-large students. In presenting the fee request, Stamp leadership details its fee requests for the Stamp, the Graduate Student Activities Fee, Undergraduate Student Activities

Fee, and SEE monies (portion of the Undergraduate Student Activities Fee), and the Graduate Legal Aid Fee (portion of the Graduate Student Activities Fee). SGA and GSG are charged with approving any changes to the respective student activities fee prior to review in the Stamp Advisory Board. Stamp is most interested in having the Stamp Fee reviewed. The Stamp Advisory Board reviews the budget in the spring so that we are building on the information our board has on the financial status of the Stamp when it reviews the fee increases in the fall. The advisory board reviews all of the various supporting documents including projected income, operating budget, proposed enhancements, and adjustments and increases related to enrollment. All questions are answered and the group discusses the proposal and makes alterations when needed. The Stamp Advisory Board then votes on its outcomes before presenting the fee proposal to the Committee on the Review of Student Fees (CRSF).

Non-Mandatory Fees Summary

DEPARTMENTS OF RESIDENT LIFE AND RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES – The Directors of Resident Life and Residential Facilities engage the Residence Hall Association (RHA) in a review of the student fee proposal annually. The process involves first presenting the fee request to the 54-member RHA Senate and responding to any questions or concerns at that meeting. The Directors then meet with the respective RHA advisory groups (RELATE and REFAB) to further discuss the proposal and gain their feedback. The advisory groups develop a resolution for RHA regarding the proposed fee increase. The RHA Senate then votes on whether they endorse the fee request. Adjustments to the fees can be made at any time during this process.

DINING – Fee proposals are reviewed by the Dining Student Advisory Board and then a presentation is made to the entire Residence Hall Association (RHA).

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICES (PARKING) – The department meets individually with SGA, GSG, and RHA leaders. The proposal is then reviewed by the Campus Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), which includes representation from SGA and GSG. DOTS also includes charts and graphs showing overall budget areas in their fee proposals.

MINORITY REPORT

University of Maryland Senate
Student Affairs Committee

Minority Report

Bill ID 11-12-12

Proposal to Change the Committee on the Review of Student Fees Operating Procedure

Introduction

On March 5, 2012, the Senate Student Affairs Committee (SAC) voted (7 for and 5 against) to recommend three items for consideration in response to Senate Bill 11-12-12, submitted by Graduate Student Government President Anna Bedford and Student Government Association President Kaiyi Xie.

We respectfully and strongly dissent from the majority decision of the Committee. In addition, we would like to emphasize that of those members who attended and voted on March 5, upon some members' reconsideration due to various issues surrounding the meeting and the votes (discussed infra), if the same vote were taken today, the proposed changes would not pass out of Committee.

We recommend:

- **that the three SAC recommendations in response to Bill 11-12-12 be returned to SAC for additional deliberation and analysis.**
- **that Bill 11-12-12 be recommitted to the SAC for additional consideration.**
- **that the SAC include additional avenues of student input in the deliberative process on Bill 11-12-12.**

Overview of Concerns

This report highlights three broad concerns:

1. Inadequate Committee proceedings
2. Insufficient fulfillment of the SEC charge
3. Incomplete proposed recommendations

Concerns with Committee Proceedings

The Student Affairs Committee failed to sufficiently evaluate all concerns surrounding the proposed recommendations due to two reasons: timing and confusion. We believe that it is simply undisputed by anyone on the Committee that this meeting lacked one essential element-time. Pressured by a lack of time, the Committee hastily voted on many matters, including actions to proceed following the meeting. Members were confused about the options moving forward and thus could not effectively choose whether to submit recommendations, request an extension, or schedule an additional Committee Meeting.

In its entirety, the final meeting of the SAC was unnecessarily constrained by time. The meeting and discussion was cut short by 25% due to the Chair's tardy arrival. Many Committee members' schedules prohibited the meeting from lasting past the 12 pm ending time, leaving the Committee without quorum and thus a true ability to act after only 45 minutes. Of the 45 minutes, the initial 15 were spent discussing the fee review process at peer institutions (an agenda item previously left unaddressed due to time constraints at a prior meeting). The remaining 30 minutes had to be divided between proposing recommendations, discussing improvements to recommendations, approving recommendations, and procedural measures. As soon as the time constraint arose as an eminent issue, the remainder of the meeting time was spent discussing options for further action.

While we reviewed past meetings, the Committee thought about the objective to make recommendations. While we made recommendations, the Committee thought about the objective to meet time constraints. While we worried about time constraints, the Committee thought about what to do when we ran out of time. Never did the Committee's objectives address the current matter at hand. Never did the Committee have enough time to fully consider revisions. Never did the Committee finish proposing recommendations.

Though the Committee's decision to put forth the recommendations was made with a constitutional majority, we believe that this decision was flawed due to insufficient information and understanding. It was the general sentiment that it was better to have something rather than nothing in the final few minutes of the Committee, before quorum disappeared. This did not leave sufficient opportunity for those opposed to bringing forth the recommendations to state their objections, and it was also clear to all members of the Committee that members still had much to discuss on the issue.

We believe that in a truly democratic process, a small majority ought not trump the rights of a minority to further discuss the issues, especially when much of the Committee has not been given the chance to fully understand the situation and alternatives. The principles of shared governance dictate that in order to fully flesh out an issue, sufficient time must be given to the actual analysis of the issues after fact-finding is completed. During this meeting, little to no chance was given to synthesize together the information collected previously over many months. In fact, due to time concerns, the Committee was led directly to making recommendations. Little guidance from Committee leadership was offered regarding the fact that there were viable alternatives to the action the Committee took. In fact, the Committee chair vocally stated her support for sending forth the recommendations in their current form. As a result, not all Committee members understood that other alternatives remained. Just because some supported the three recommendations that resulted from this meeting, this does not mean they considered the issues completely resolved.

The final Committee Report of the majority states: “After reviewing these policies and analyzing the various data collected, the committee considered possible recommendations.” We find it incredibly far-fetched to claim that in the sole post-fact-finding meeting, which was cut short by 25%, any actual analysis of the data took place. With the knowledge that the Committee was short on time, Committee members leapt to moving potential recommendations to the floor.

Fulfillment of SEC Charge to SAC

In order to completely and effectively fulfill a Committee charge, sufficient consideration and deliberation, as is consistent with the democratic process, should be given to all aspects of the proposal. Recommendations should not be taken simply as individual items, but as sums of the whole. The amount of time and effort dedicated to researching and gathering information on current policies is critical, but attempting to synthesize such information in such a limited time frame is unrealistic. Shortchanging deliberation in an effort to fulfill a charge is not completing the given charge at all. This harms further consideration of the unresolved recommendations by insinuating that the Committee had contemplated such recommendations and decided against advancing them.

Concerns with Proposed Recommendations

Each of the three recommendations was approved with large majorities. However, the crux of the issue lies in the fact that Committee members were not expecting that there was time for only 3 recommendations, and no more time to proceed further with discussing others. Thus, support for the 3 current recommendations is not analogous to support for *only* these 3 recommendations- there were many questions left unanswered that merit discussion. Thus, we feel that these three recommendations, *prima facie*, are insufficient in addressing the issues brought up in Bill 11-12-12 and addressing the Senate Executive Committee’s charge.

Additional Recommendations

We feel that the following have not been addressed in the current recommendations:

- The definition and role of a student fee (what normatively does and does not constitute an appropriate use of fee monies).
- Sufficiency and type of financial information available to unit-level fee review bodies.
- What constitutes a sufficient unit-level fee review body.
- The transparency and operating rules of the actual Committee for the Review of Student Fees (CRSF).
- The procedures of electing a chair of CRSF.

We feel that the aforementioned are essential to a complete discussion on Bill 11-12-12. The fact that the SAC did not adopt or reject any of the aforementioned, even though they were featured prominently in the fact-finding phase of the Committee's actions, elucidates truly how limited in scope the 3 recommendations are. In fact, the SAC failed to even broach these topics in its meeting due to time constraints.

Conclusion

Despite an initially vague charge, the substantive and detailed research in conjunction with the lack of any discussion or stance on the aforementioned recommendations is clearly indicative of the incomplete assessment of the proposal and issue as a whole.

Signatories

Whitney Beck
Madison Ferraro
Stephanie Graf
An Hoang
Brandon Levey
Kaiyi Xie