

University Senate

April 19, 2017

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 119

Call to Order

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

Approval of the Minutes

Chair Goodman asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the April 6, 2017 Senate meeting; hearing none, he declared the minutes approved as distributed.

Report of the Chair

Committee Volunteer Period

Chair Goodman reminded Senators that the Committee Volunteer Period is still open until May 1st. He noted that committee members do not need to be Senators and that the 10 Senate committees address topics related to students, faculty, staff affairs, educational and campus affairs. He stated that the application to volunteer is available on the Senate website. The Senate's Committee on Committees will be selecting volunteers to serve on each committee and will notify selected volunteers over the summer.

Remaining Senate Meetings

Chair Goodman reminded Senators that this is the last meeting for all outgoing Senators and asked outgoing Senators to stand and be recognized.

Chair Goodman explained that the May 4th Transition Senate Meeting will be for all continuing and incoming senators and would be his last meeting as Chair. On May 4th, the Senate will elect our next Chair-Elect, Dan Falvey will take over as Chair, and the Senate will vote for the elected committees of the Senate. The names of candidates running for the various committees and their candidacy statements will be distributed on April 20th. The agenda and any additional materials for that meeting will be sent out on April 27th.

Chair's Remarks

Chair Goodman spoke about the importance of the work of the Sexual Assault Prevention Task Force and the problems of sexual assault on college campuses. He also thanked the committees, committee chairs, task forces, and subcommittees of the Research Council for all their work on the important issues brought to the Senate this year. He recognized the Senate staff for their work and for making everything run smoothly.

Telework Guidelines and Protocol (Senate Doc. No. 15-16-25) (Information)

Goodman presented the Telework Guidelines and Protocol (Senate Doc. No. 15-16-25) as an informational item. He explained that these documents were approved by University Human

Resources (UHR) and the Staff Affairs Committee and would be available on UHR's website as a resource to staff.

Revisions to the School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation (ARCH) Plan of Organization (Senate Doc. No. 14-15-38) (Action)

Marc Pound, Chair of the Elections, Representation, and Governance (ERG) Committee, presented the Revisions to the School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation (ARCH) Plan of Organization.

Goodman opened the floor to discussion of the proposal; hearing none, Goodman called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 101 in favor, 1 opposed, and 4 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Sexual Assault Prevention at the University of Maryland (Senate Doc. No. 16-17-11) (Action)

Steve Petkas, Chair of the Joint President/Senate Sexual Assault Prevention Task Force, presented the Sexual Assault Prevention at the University of Maryland report.

Goodman opened the floor to discussion of the proposal.

Chair-Elect Falvey made a procedural motion on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee as follows:

Each speaker will be given two minutes to discuss Agenda Item 6 - Sexual Assault Prevention at the University of Maryland and any amendments thereto. A speaker may only speak a second time once everyone else has had an opportunity to speak.

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

Chair Goodman opened the floor to discussion of the motion; hearing none, he called for a vote on the motion. The result was 105 in favor, 8 opposed, and 1 abstention. **The motion to limit the time of each speaker passed.**

Chair Goodman noted that the Senate Office had put out a request for amendments in advance of the Senate meeting. He stated that voting senators could make and second amendments on the floor but previously submitted amendments would be considered first. Goodman also stated that the discussion and amendments would be discussed in order of the following six categories: Programming Structure, Communication Strategy, Coordination of Prevention Plan, Resources & Implementation, Process Evaluation & Outcome Assessment Plan, and Other.

Chair Goodman stated that the Senate would start with the Programming Structure section.

Senator Stanley, undergraduate student, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, made a motion to amend the content of the student leader training on page 15 of the report as follows:

The Task Force recommends that the leadership (the President and at least one other student leader) of every student organization should be required to participate in a specialized online sexual assault prevention training as a condition for registering as a recognized student organization through the Stamp Student Union – Student Organization Resource Center (SORC). This unique training should be developed with a focus on issues that are pertinent to student organization social settings and should incorporate existing relevant training tools (such

as video/social media) but should also be tailored for student organization leaders to ~~help them identify and address high-risk behaviors involving alcohol and effective bystander intervention strategies.~~ **understand various dynamics/characteristics of sexual violence and perpetration; identify misconceptions, behaviors, and/or sentiments that contribute to a climate that enables sexual violence, understand how positive bystander intervention can be used to ameliorate a climate that isn't intolerant of sexual violence, connect how positive bystander's intervention impact on climate affects prevalence of sexual violence.**

The motion was seconded.

Chair Goodman opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Petkas asked for clarification on which program would have the content about perpetration.

Senator Stanley clarified that he intended for it to be part of the online training for student leaders.

Petkas explained that the research is unclear on the effectiveness of content on perpetration. For this reason, the Task Force is opposed to this amendment.

Amelia Arria, task force member, explained that the report includes "understanding definitions of sexual assault" as part of the training. This phrase includes many of the ideas in this amendment. She asked why the alcohol portion was excluded.

Senator Stanley clarified that the alcohol portion was excluded because it was in other trainings. He noted that alcohol could be added back in if someone else wanted to propose an amendment to the amendment. He asked for clarification on where information on rape culture, perpetration, types of rape, etc. was incorporated.

Fatima Taylor, task force member, stated that she appreciated the comments and noted that the report does not enumerate everything that will be included in the training. She also explained that training mode has shifted from presentations on statistics and definitions to bystander intervention as that has shown to be more effective. She noted that definitions and other explanatory information would still be included.

Petkas stated that describing all of the parts of the online training is unnecessary.

Seeing no further discussion, Goodman called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 33 in favor, 67 opposed, and 14 abstentions. **The amendment failed.**

Senator Stanley, undergraduate student, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, made a motion to amend the recommendations on page 18 for the University to consider the establishment of a sexual violence prevention fund as follows:

Prevention efforts at the University are a two-way street. Creating a culture that is intolerant of sexual violence can not be attained exclusively through top-down means. Members of the campus interacting with each other on these issues through their own volition are a necessary component of a campus that does not tolerate sexual violence. Enabling the organic programming that fosters a healthy culture and inhibits sexual violence advances the goals of the Task Force. In addition, the education and internalization that develops from organic programming only enables better outcomes from the training and programming provided by the University. The University should consider the establishment of a sexual violence prevention fund, similar to the

Sustainability Fund, as vehicle to empower and proliferate organic programming within the campus community.

The motion was seconded.

Senator Stanley explained that this amendment was not to establish a sexual violence prevention fund but was simply asking the University to consider establishing such a fund. He compared this fund to the existing, successful sustainability fund and explained that the prevention fund would allow for all campus citizens to be active in empowering student programming around sexual assault. He added that groups would be more likely to participate and create more organic interactions around the topic with support of this fund.

Petkas stated that the idea is valuable, but noted that the amendment was outside the scope of the Task Force's charge. He explained that the Task Force was not called upon to create budgets and expressed concern of putting more work on the Sexual Assault Prevention Committee (SAPC), which would be a distraction from their other programming responsibilities.

Senator Stanley stated that the idea behind this amendment was for the University's administration to work with the Student Government Association (SGA). He stated that it was not designed to be part of the work of SAPC.

Seeing no further discussion, Goodman called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 40 in favor, 67 opposed, and 7 abstentions. **The amendment failed.**

Goodman asked if there were any other amendments on the Programming Structure section. Seeing none, he stated that the Senate would move to the Communications Strategy section.

Senator Aparicio Blackwell, exempt staff, asked what was being done to ensure that non-English speaking members of the University community received the information and had appropriate access to resources.

Petkas noted that this part of the communication strategy is greater detail than what has been indicated in the report.

Catherine Carroll, task force member, stated that OCRSM is responsible for ensuring that limited-English proficient members of the University community understand available resources and support and receive the necessary training. She explained that OCRSM provides the online staff training in Spanish and also provides in-person training in Spanish. She added that OCRSM provides customized training for speakers of various languages while maintaining the plain language principles to ensure that the information is easy to understand. She noted the importance of this issue and encouraged anyone to contact OCRSM for more information.

Senator Ambrose, faculty, School of Architecture, Planning, & Preservation, stated that the only consequence outlined in the recommendations is the student consequence of a registration block and noted that all consequences should be clearly communicated.

Petkas stated that the consequence for not completing the student leader training would be that the group would not be a recognized student organization.

Sue Sherburne, task force member, stated that Athletics has a process in place for consequences for not completing required training and noted that it is still individualized. She

added that if an entire team did not complete a requirement, the Athletic Director would decide the consequences.

Lola Taiwo, task force member, explained that in Fraternity & Sorority Life, not completing the requirements leads to the chapters not being able to participate in certain activities and/or not being recognized on campus.

Petkas stated that some of the confusion may have come from the existing programs having structures in place and that registration blocks are a new idea.

Goodman asked if there was any further discussion on the Communications Strategy section. Seeing none, he stated the Senate would move to the Coordination of Prevention Plan section.

Senator Stanley, undergraduate student, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, made a motion to create a new oversight group on page 22 of the report as follows:

An oversight group will be created that annually reports to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). The body will be composed of two undergraduates, one graduate, one staff three faculty. Senators on the SEC, executives of the SGA, and executives of GSG will be solicited for input on appointments.

The oversight group will produce an annual report that includes:

- **Bottlenecks in execution**
- **Deficiencies or surpluses in funding**
- **Areas of strengths and areas of improvement/weakness in administrative support**
- **Discrepancies between resources requested and resources provided**

The oversight group will have its report published in a visible and accessible location on the front page of the centralized website. There will be a visible mechanism for requesting an existing report or requesting a report once it is finished. Reports will be provided to requesters without discretion. The group will ensure the report is sent to the SGA legislature, the GSG legislature, Senate members, the applicable offices of all high-risk and high-need groups.

The motion was seconded.

Senator Stanley explained that this amendment is intended to give campus stakeholders additional input.

Petkas stated that the Task Force had considered the idea of an oversight body and voted unanimously against the creation of an oversight group due to issues of confusion over membership and roles as well as the creation of additional bureaucracy.

Senator Berger, undergraduate student, A. James Clark School of Engineering, stated that he appreciated the efforts of his fellow undergraduate students but noted that micromanaging the

process undercuts the importance of the issue. He suggested that any changes that Senators would like to see be brought as proposals to the Senate so that they can undergo the full vetting process.

Senator Spaur, undergraduate student, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, stated that she supports this amendment and agrees that more oversight can help ensure successful implementation.

Petkas stated that the SAPC has adequate membership and oversight.

Senator Stanley explained that students are concerned about the implementation process and see the oversight committee to ensure the recommendations would be acted upon.

Seeing no further discussion, Goodman called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 40 in favor, 61 opposed, and 7 abstentions. **The amendment failed.**

Dean Lushniak, School of Public Health, congratulated the Task Force on its work and proposed an amendment to add faculty members to SAPC on page 21 of the report as follows:

The SAPC should be chaired by the individual responsible for sexual assault prevention referenced in the above recommendation. The committee should provide inclusive representation of key offices involved in or connected with sexual assault prevention at the University, including the Office of Civil Rights & Sexual Misconduct (OCRSM), CARE, University Marketing and Communications, the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Office of Undergraduate Studies, Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, the Department of Resident Life, the Department of Fraternity and Sorority Life, the Student Government Association (SGA), the Graduate Student Government (GSG), ~~and~~ the Graduate School, **and faculty member(s) with expertise in sexual assault prevention work and evidence based practices.**

The motion was seconded.

Goodman opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Petkas noted that the contributions of Arria were invaluable and stated that the Task Force was in support of this amendment.

Seeing no further discussion, Goodman called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 93 in favor, 12 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The amendment passed.**

Goodman stated that the Senate would now move to the Resources & Implementation section.

Dean Lushniak made a motion to amend the report on pages 23 and 24 to further explain the role of the School of Public Health's Office of Planning and Evaluation in data analysis as follows:

The Task Force recommends that the SAPC work with the Office of Planning and Evaluation in the School of Public Health to develop the evaluation strategy, ~~and~~ perform the evaluation tasks using existing online survey technology, **and provide a quality improvement process which utilizes the data to influence implementation of best practices.** These tasks include designing the overall evaluation system, conducting the evaluation, analyzing data, ~~and~~ writing

reports that summarize the data analyses, **and providing data in a format that facilitates decision making in order for changes to be implemented.** The evaluation framework should include a staged approach as outlined below.

The motion was seconded.

Goodman opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Petkas stated that the amendment adds more detail to something the Task Force already proposed and that the Task Force is in favor of this amendment.

Seeing no further discussion, Goodman called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 97 in favor, 9 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The amendment passed.**

Senator Douek, undergraduate student, College of Arts & Humanities, made a motion to amend the report on page 23 after paragraph 4 to allow for religious exemptions to required programming as follows:

In the event a student has a religious objection to any of the materials or programs associated or even affiliated with the Task Force's Recommendations, the student can voluntarily opt out without any consequences. An administrator can request an exemption letter from the student's chaplain to be certain that the student does in fact have a religious conflict.

The motion was seconded.

Goodman opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Senator Douek explained that he supports report fully but wanted to make sure that the University provides students with an opportunity to opt-out if necessary.

Petkas stated that the University is legally required to provide training because of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). He added that there is already a process in place for sexual assault survivors to seek an exemption and that this amendment was not necessary as anyone could contact OCRSM if they are concerned about their ability to complete the training.

Senator Callaghan, faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that many religions have beliefs on having or discussing sex, but no one chooses to be assaulted or witness an assault so this training is still valuable and necessary. For these reasons, she opposed the amendment.

Senator Stanley asked how someone who asks for an exemption could meet the requirements.

Senator Allen, undergraduate student, Undergraduate Studies, asked if the proposer could provide an example.

Senator Douek stated that he did not have an example and noted that people can be true to their identity and comply with policy.

Chair-Elect Falvey made a motion to call the question and close debate on the amendment.

Goodman called for a vote on the motion to call the question on the amendment and reminded Senators that the motion needed a 2/3 voted to pass. The result was 89 in favor and 14 opposed. **The motion to call the question and close debate on the amendment passed.**

Goodman called for a vote on the religious exemptions amendment. The result was 7 in favor 98 opposed and 3 abstentions. **The amendment failed.**

Goodman asked if there was any additional discussion on the Resources & Implementation section. Seeing none, he stated that the Senate would move to the Process Evaluation & Outcome Assessment Plan section.

Goodman asked if there was any discussion on the Process Evaluation & Outcome Assessment Plan section. Seeing none, he stated that the Senate would move to the Other section.

Senator Stanley, undergraduate student, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, made a motion to amend the recommendations on page 26 of the report to create a new section which recommends that the University lobby for sexual violence education in primary and secondary schools as follows:

IV. Strategic Context

In considering this report, it is important to realize that from a strategic view the proposed recommendations in this report are ultimately reactive. The proposed university programming is attempting to change attitudes at the tail-end of when people's beliefs are malleable. For many their views will have already solidified by the time they matriculate to university. Sexual violence is not exclusive to universities; research indicates that it is pervasive at many high schools as well. Addressing sexual violence starting in tertiary education is not effective.

As an academic institution, we should strive to practice preventive medicine rather than be reactive. The solution is age-appropriate education in primary and secondary schools. Intolerance to sexual violence is an attitude that will be internalized in our communities not through acute focus in University, but by exposure during all developmental stages.

The old adage goes: If you are not part of the solution you are part of the problem. In its role as the nation's first "Do Good" campus, the university will be a part of that solution. This is not stating that the expectation is for the University to single-handedly shape this issue. It is just affirming that we will play our part by utilizing opportunities when they present themselves.

The University should lobby for primary and secondary school education when viable opportunities exist. The University should consider whether this should be conducted utilizing the University's Office of Government Relations and/or by enabling professionals affiliated with the university who are familiar with the topics of sexual education and sexual assault prevention (e.g. OCRSM Director, CARE Office Director, DFSL Sexual Assault Prevention Coordinator, etc.).

The motion was seconded.

Goodman opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Senator Stanley stated that the first three paragraphs of the amendment explain its importance and that the last paragraph says the University should have someone in the government

relations office advance primary and secondary education or give resources to empower and enable University members to lobby for bills in the state senate.

Petkas stated that the amendment was outside the purview of the Task Force's charge and added that there are already opportunities at the University for students to advocate with the Maryland State Legislature.

Senator Lathrop, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, & Natural Science, made a motion to call the question and end debate on the amendment.

Goodman called for a vote on the motion to call the question and close debate on the amendment and reminded Senators that this motion needed a 2/3 vote to pass. The result was 73 in favor and 30 opposed. **The motion to call the question and close debate on the amendment passed.**

Goodman called for a vote the amendment for lobbying for primary and secondary education in the Maryland legislature. The result was 20 in favor, 79 opposed, and 6 abstentions. **The amendment failed.**

Goodman asked if there were any other amendments or comments; seeing none, he called for a vote on the proposal as amended. The result was 95 in favor, 5 opposed, and 1 abstention. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Special Order of the Day
Pamela Abshire
Associate Professor, Electrical & Computer Engineering
Jennifer Golbeck
Associate Professor, College of Information Studies
In Support of Science: The March for Science & CASE

Pamela Abshire and Jennifer Golbeck discussed UMD's participation in the March for Science on April 22, 2017 and the University's Celebration of American Science & Engineering (CASE), on April 21, 2017.

Abshire explained that the March for Science is non-partisan but aims to change policy. She provided an overview of the March's events and logistics for UMD's participation.

Golbeck discussed the speakers at the Celebration of American Science & Engineering (CASE) and encouraged Senators to attend.

Goodman thanked Abshire and Golbeck for their presentation.

New Business

Senator Cumings, faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering, made a motion to endorse a resolution regarding the March for Science as follows:

Whereas the University conducts groundbreaking scientific research on some of the biggest challenges facing our global community,

Whereas the University strives to create and disseminate knowledge, and

Whereas the University embraces the positive impact of scientific progress on our state, the nation, and the world,

Be it resolved that the University of Maryland's University Senate, as the representative and elected body of the faculty, staff, and students, endorses the mission of the March for Science as follows:

The March for Science champions robustly funded and publicly communicated science as a pillar of human freedom and prosperity. We unite as a diverse, nonpartisan group to call for science that upholds the common good and for political leaders and policy makers to enact evidence based policies in the public interest.

The motion was seconded.

Goodman opened the floor to discussion of the resolution; hearing none, he called for a vote on the resolution. The result was 84 in favor, 4 opposed, and 1 abstention. **The resolution passed.**

Senator Vasquez, undergraduate student, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that she encouraged DFSL to consult with all the Greek councils when developing their requirements for sexual assault prevention training for Greek organizations.

Senator Jacobson, exempt staff, asked for clarification on why the telework guidelines were presented as an informational item.

Chair Goodman explained that the guidelines were an administrative recommendation and not a policy. The Senate votes on policies.

Senator Bond, exempt staff, explained that the Staff Affairs Committee worked with University Human Resources (UHR) to provide feedback on these guidelines. He explained that the guidelines are directives from UHR and not a policy.

Senator Jacobson, exempt staff, asked what a Senator should do if there are ongoing concerns regarding this issue.

Chair Goodman stated that any member of the campus community could submit a proposal to have the Senate consider making a telework policy.

Senator Bond noted that the Office of General Counsel was involved in the discussions between UHR and the Staff Affairs Committee.

Adjournment

Chair Goodman adjourned the meeting at 4:59 p.m.