

University Senate

September 17, 2014

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 119

Call to Order

Senate Chair Webster called the meeting to order at 3:16 p.m. and welcomed senators to the upcoming year.

Approval of the Minutes

Chair Webster asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the May 7, 2014, meeting. Hearing none, he declared the minutes approved as distributed.

Report of the Chair

Chair Webster reminded senators that only senators and those introduced by senators could speak on the Senate floor. He also asked senators to state their name, constituency, and college before speaking so that these could be recorded for the record.

BOR Faculty & Staff Awards

Webster announced that the Board of Regents' Faculty and Staff Awards were developed by the Council of University System Faculty (CUSF) and the Council of University System Staff (CUSS) to recognize exceptional performance of faculty and staff members at USM institutions. Each year, faculty and staff are nominated by their colleagues in a number of areas and their names are sent forward to CUSF and CUSS by the institutions' presidents for consideration. Final recipients receive \$1,000 awards, and their achievements are announced to the USM community.

Last year, two University of Maryland faculty members were selected as award recipients in the areas of "Innovative Excellence" and "Research, Scholarship, & Creative Activity". These faculty members are Dr. Michael Ohadi and Dr. Jimmy Lin.

Webster asked the awardees to stand for recognition by the Senate.

2013-2014 Senate Legislation Log (Senate Doc. No. 14-15-01) (Information)

Webster explained that the log had been provided to the Senate as an informational item. It gives an overview of all of the work completed last year and the pending legislation that will continue this year.

Approval of the Standing Committee & Council Slates 2014-2015 (Senate Doc. No. 14-15-02) (Action)

Willie Brown, Chair of the Committee on Committees, provided background on the selection process and made a motion to approve the standing committee and council slates as presented. He also noted several replacements that had been made prior to the meeting. Webster asked whether there was discussion on the slates; hearing none, he called for a vote of the Senate. The result was 92 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the slates as presented passed.**

Review of the University of Maryland Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (Senate Doc. No. 12-13-24) (Action)

Bradley Hatfield, Chair of the Joint Provost/Senate Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Guidelines Task Force, presented the Review of the University of Maryland Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure and provided background information on the task force's review process.

Willie Brown, Chair-Elect, made a procedure motion on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee to limit discussion to three minutes per speaker for discussion on this agenda item. The motion was seconded. Chair Webster opened the floor to discussion on the motion; hearing none, he called for a vote on the motion. The result was 106 in favor, 7 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion passed.**

Chair Webster explained that Chair-Elect Brown would monitor the timer for all speakers and gave a brief overview of the procedures for handling amendments. For each amendment, the senator who proposed it would be asked to present it and provide a brief rationale. Each amendment would then be discussed and voted on in the order in which it was received. When all pre-submitted amendments were considered, additional amendments would be considered. A final vote would be taken on the report as amended.

Chair Webster invited Senator Boyle to present the first amendment.

Senator Boyle, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, presented his amendment and provided a rationale.

Guidelines Page 9 – Research, Scholarly or Creative Activities

~~Work that has been submitted Pieces in preparation that are not completed and but not yet accepted for publication should not appear on a CV.⁴~~

~~1. The one exception is working papers, customary in certain fields such as economics and mathematics. These should be listed under “Monographs, Reports and Extension Publications.”~~

The motion to amend the report was seconded.

Chair Webster opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Hatfield responded that the task force recognizes that the inclusion of submitted works speaks to trajectory. He also noted that the work on Lyterati, the University's new comprehensive faculty information system, was parallel to the task force's work. While the task force did not include submitted work in its recommendations, it does recognize the merits of including them.

Chair Webster called for a vote on the first amendment. The result was 72 in favor, 26 opposed, and 14 abstention(s). **The amendment passed.**

Chair Webster invited Senator Boyle to present the second amendment.

Senator Boyle presented his amendment as follows and provided a rationale.

Guidelines Page 9 & 10 – Research, Scholarly or Creative Activities

All authors should be listed in the order in which they appear on the publication. In exceptional cases, e.g., when the work is a product of a large group (more than 10 authors), not all authors need be listed. As an example, ~~you the candidate~~ may list the first three, the last three, and ~~yourself the candidate him or herself~~ (including ~~your~~ placement in the total author list). That is, if a candidate named "Candidate" is the 97th author, the citation may be listed as: *Smith, Jones, Curley...Candidate (97th)...Moe, Larry, Shemp* (total of 189 authors). Candidates ~~should~~ **may** designate the identity of the author with intellectual leadership on jointly authored papers (if this designation can be appropriately ascertained) by using * or placing that name in bold, and identifying which co-authors they mentored as undergraduate and graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, faculty research assistants, and junior faculty. **In some units, the designation with * and bold may be inappropriate for the culture of the area; a unit with the approval of its college may choose a policy of abstaining from these designations. Candidates should clearly characterize their contribution(s) to a collaborative activity, as practiced in the Department.**

The motion to amend the report was seconded.

Hatfield responded that this amendment is consistent with the task force's principle of deference to the local level. The identification of leadership is an important element of the APT review process.

Chair Webster opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Senator Davis, faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering, stated that he was in favor of the amendment because there are differences in practice among disciplines.

Senator Alexander, Emeritus Faculty, questioned the use of the word "Department" at the end of that section.

Steven Marcus, member of the Task Force, stated that the Guidelines include a notation that the word Department should be interpreted as the first-level unit, which sometimes is a college.

Chair Webster called for a vote on the second amendment. The result was 85 in favor, 13 opposed, and 7 abstention(s). **The amendment passed.**

Chair Webster invited Senator Harris to present the third amendment.

Senator Harris, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, presented his amendment as follows and provided a rationale.

Guidelines Page 20 – External Evaluators

...In some circumstances, a greater proportion of letters from collaborators may be needed in order to provide a complete, equitable, and thorough evaluation of the contributions of the candidate. Such letters may be allowed if justification is provided by the Unit undertaking the evaluation (e.g., in cases of very large collaborations where coauthors number in the tens to hundreds).*

The motion to amend the report was seconded.

Hatfield responded that this amendment reinforces our principle of deference to the first-level unit.

Chair Webster opened the floor to discussion of the amendment; hearing none, he called for a vote on the third amendment. The result was 94 in favor, 3 opposed, and 10 abstention(s). **The amendment passed.**

Chair Webster invited Senator Lindemann to present the next six amendments. He explained that each amendment would be presented and seconded individually, but that he would hold discussion on all six amendments together because they were interrelated. However, each amendment would be voted on individually.

Senator Lindemann, Faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, presented the fourth amendment as follows.

APT Policy Page 2 – Purpose of this Policy

The University of Maryland is dedicated to the discovery and the transmission of knowledge, to the achievement of excellence in **all its** academic disciplines, **and to the growth and development of our society. To achieve this, the University is committed to developing and sustaining an excellent and diverse faculty. A fair, unbiased, and impartial appointment, tenure, and promotion process is essential to this goal.** Each faculty member has a personal responsibility for contributing to the achievement of excellence in his or her own academic discipline and for exercising the best judgment in advancing the department, the college, and the University. Those faculty members holding the rank of professor have the greatest responsibility for establishing and maintaining the highest standards of academic performance within the University. This Policy on the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty exists to set the standards for appointment and promotion to the various faculty ranks and to recognize and to encourage the achievement of excellence on the part of the faculty members through the awarding of tenure and through promotion within the faculty ranks. ~~Through this process the University builds and enhances its educational programs and services and it advances the state of knowledge, which supports the growth and development of our society.~~

The motion to amend the report was seconded.

Senator Lindemann presented the fifth amendment.

APT Policy Page 11 – II. Criteria for Appointment and Promotion

The criteria for appointment, tenure and promotion shall reflect the educational mission of the University of Maryland at College Park to provide an undergraduate education ranked among the best in the nation; to provide a nationally and internationally renowned program of graduate education and research, making significant contributions to the arts, humanities, the professions, and the sciences; **to provide every student with an education that incorporates the values of diversity and inclusion;** and to provide public service to the state and the nation embodying the best tradition of outstanding land-grant colleges and universities.

The motion to amend the report was seconded.

Senator Lindemann presented the sixth amendment.

APT Policy Page 11 – II. Criteria for Appointment and Promotion

Each college, school, and department shall develop brief, general, written criteria for tenure and/or promotion. **The criteria should be reviewed periodically by the unit, as deemed necessary, but no less frequently than once every five (5) years. This review should include consideration of the unit's progress toward increasing the diversity of its tenured faculty.** The criteria to be considered in appointments and promotions fall into three general categories: (1) performance in teaching, advising, and mentoring of students; (2) performance in research, scholarship, and creative activity; (3) performance of professional service to the university, the profession, or the community.

The motion to amend the report was seconded.

Senator Lindemann presented the seventh amendment.

APT Policy Page 27 – C. Third-level Review

1. A third- or campus-level review committee shall be established in the following manner: The Provost shall appoint nine faculty members holding the rank of professor, one from each of the eight large colleges (colleges listed here) and one from among the four small colleges (colleges listed here). Since this committee shall make its recommendation on the basis of whether or not the University's high standards for tenure and/or promotion have been met, members of this committee shall have a track record of outstanding academic judgment along with sufficient intellectual breadth and depth to be capable of comparing and judging candidates from varied disciplinary, cross-disciplinary, and professional backgrounds. **The Provost should endeavor to ensure that the committee is diverse.** No small college shall be represented on the committee more frequently than once in every three years. Candidates for the committee shall be solicited from....

The motion to amend the report was seconded.

Senator Lindemann presented the eighth amendment.

Guidelines Page 10 & 11 – The Curriculum Vitae - Teaching, Mentoring and Advising

Teaching, Mentoring and Advising

1. Courses taught in the last five years. Indicate enrollment and unusual formats.
2. Course or Curriculum Development, **including the creation of courses that focus on underrepresented populations, the integration of diverse cultural perspectives into existing courses, and the use of varied pedagogical strategies to meet the learning styles of a diverse student body.**
3. Textbooks, Manuals, Notes, Software Web Pages and Other Contributions to Teaching.

4. Teaching Awards and Other Special Recognition.
5. Advising (Other than research direction): Indicate number of students per year
 1. Undergraduate
 2. Graduate
 3. Other advising and mentoring activities (advising student groups, **advising underrepresented students**, special assignments, recruiting, faculty **membership** mentorship, **recruiting/advising/mentoring activities that enhance diversity and inclusion**, etc.)
6. Advising: Research direction. This refers to students whose projects the candidate has directed or chaired. The name of the student and academic year(s) involved should be included, as well as placement of the student(s), if project is completed.
7. Contribution to learning outcomes assessment.
8. Extension, Entrepreneurship and Public Engagement Activities. Major programs established, workshops, presentations, media activities, awards, honors, etc.

The motion to amend the report was seconded.

Senator Lindemann presented the ninth amendment.

Guidelines Page 12 – Teaching Portfolio

In addition to **materials for the tenure and/or promotion** dossier, **you the candidate will prepare a teaching portfolio, according to Department guidelines, which could include the following types of items: course syllabi; a statement of teaching philosophy; a statement about how the candidate addresses diversity and inclusion in teaching; reflective assessments; learning outcomes assessment materials; and mentoring accomplishments, such as placement of advisees in academic and professional positions. Examples of teaching portfolio elements are included in the Appendix.**

The motion to amend the report was seconded.

Hatfield responded that the task force did not deliberate on these amendments but that they were consistent with the culture of the University and practice of the Office of Faculty Affairs.

Chair Webster opened the floor to discussion of all six amendments.

Senator Lindemann introduced Kumea Shorter-Gooden, Chief Diversity Officer and Assistant Vice President, who authored the amendments.

Shorter-Gooden stated that these amendments align with the principles in the Diversity Strategic Plan. The tenure plan calls for us to provide every student with an education that incorporates the values of diversity and inclusion to ensure that

undergraduates acquire the knowledge, experiences, and cultural competencies to succeed in a multicultural and globally connected world; to recruit, promote, and retain a diverse faculty and staff; develop inclusive learning environments; and ensure that policies and structures are in place to support our diversity goals and aspirations. The amendments help support those principles in our tenure and promotion process by making our commitment to diversity and inclusion explicit; reminding us of our goal for an excellent and diverse faculty; going beyond doing no harm but rather doing good; and recognizing the importance of diversity and inclusion in teaching, advising and mentoring. These amendments are particularly important given the continued disparities in faculty retention, promotion, and tenure based on race, ethnicity, and gender. She urged the Senate to support amendments 4-9 in order to better align our APT policies, procedures, and guidelines, with our University goals and aspirations.

Senator Moser Jones, faculty, School of Public Health, spoke in favor of amendment eight because faculty who create courses focused on underrepresented populations and integration of diverse cultural perspectives should be recognized for that work. Faculty within her unit have integrated cultural competence into their pedagogy because they are training students to work with the diverse population of Maryland, the nation, and the world.

Senator Bigio, faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering, stated that he supported the amendments but would like clarification on how diversity is determined and whether it is different for each discipline.

Shorter-Gooden stated that diversity is broad and wide-ranging. Any areas where there are disparities in access and opportunities such as race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, gender expression, religion, socio-economic background, first-generational status, and ability. Diversity is about teaching and educating our students to understand areas where people are underrepresented as well as privileged. We should also use pedagogical strategies to reach all of our students.

Senator Aparicio Blackwell, exempt staff, stated that she was in favor of amendment eight. It is important when dealing with our surrounding communities by having students engage in issues larger than their perspective.

Senator Hurtt, faculty, School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation, stated that he is generally in favor of these amendments. He raised concerns about how “a unit’s progress towards diversity” would be quantified in amendment six. In some instances, the financial situation can leave a unit with its hands tied. While there are other metrics for progress, they might not count. He also raised concerns about amendment nine putting candidates in a difficult situation to justify their work.

Steven Marcus, member of the Task Force, stated that the language that is proposed is listed as one example of the type of piece that could be included in the teaching portfolio. While the portfolio is mandatory, whether something like this is included is up to the candidate.

Senator Bengfort, graduate student, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, stated that it is very important for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) to incorporate diversity in their curricula, particularly for areas that do not have an opportunity to do that. We need to find a way to encourage people to join these professions. He encouraged senators to support amendment eight.

Senator Blair, part-time graduate student, expressed support for the amendments. She noted that amendment four includes language that has just been relocated from previous text. She also noted that a unit's five-year review is an appropriate time to consider the diversity of its faculty as noted in amendment six. Several of these amendments are just examples or clarifications.

Senator Davis, faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering, stated that he would still like clarification on the definition of diversity including other forms such as political and dietary diversity. We have an overall commitment to diversity but he was concerned about incorporating diversity language in every aspect of our policies.

Senator White, faculty, College of Education, stated that she supported the amendments. She noted that we make assumptions about our commitment to diversity and that being a good person means that we are honoring that. She stated that diversity means being sensitive to perspectives that we do not have. As educators, we have an obligation to encourage or be sensitive to those perspectives. This can often translate into global competitiveness or achievement gap issues. We need to understand the perspectives of those we seek to serve. She stated that she was encouraged by this language.

Senator Alexander, emeritus faculty, raised concerns about the language of amendment six. He did not think that the proposed text was included in the appropriate place and could be more precise with its intention.

Webster asked whether the senator was proposing an amendment to the amendment. Alexander stated that he did not have amended text at this time.

Senator O'Meara, faculty, College of Education, stated that she supported amendment six and noted that the language is consistent with efforts currently underway in the Office of Faculty Affairs to provide a public report of the outcomes of the APT process, ADVANCE data collection efforts on the demographics of our faculty, and progress towards advancement for different stages and groups.

Senator Tune, exempt staff, stated that the language is referring to the unit not a particular candidate. He stated that he supported the amendment.

Steven Marcus, member of the Task Force, clarified that it is possible that a unit might discover that some people of color were not given tenure because the criteria were too narrow to allow those populations to succeed.

Chair Webster called for a vote on the fourth amendment. The result was 94 in favor, 6 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The amendment passed.**

Chair Webster called for a vote on the fifth amendment. The result was 88 in favor, 13 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The amendment passed.**

Chair Webster called for a vote on the sixth amendment. The result was 61 in favor, 34 opposed, and 6 abstentions. **The amendment passed.**

Chair Webster called for a vote on the seventh amendment. The result was 90 in favor, 7 opposed, and 5 abstentions. **The amendment passed.**

Chair Webster called for a vote on the eighth amendment. The result was 82 in favor, 23 opposed, and 4 abstentions. **The amendment passed.**

Chair Webster called for a vote on the ninth amendment. The result was 70 in favor, 31 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The amendment passed.**

Chair Webster invited Senator Ontiveros and Senator Goodman to present amendments ten, eleven, and twelve. He noted that each amendment would be presented individually and would be discussed at once because the amendments were on opposite sides of the same issue. Then each amendment would be voted on individually.

Senator Ontiveros, faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, presented the tenth amendment and provided a rationale.

Guidelines Page 20 – External Evaluators

The Committee must include a list of all the evaluators to whom a formal request was sent, even if the evaluators do not reply or decline to write. Copies of the letters (or emails) of refusal must be included in the dossier. Verbal communications will not be accepted and ~~any prejudicial discussion regarding declines or non-answers is discouraged~~ **shall not be construed as positive or negative comment on the candidate's qualification for tenure**. In the log, the initial date that the evaluator was contacted should be included, when candidate materials were sent (if different from initial) and the date of response (either when the evaluation was received or the reviewer declined to review).

The motion to amend the report was seconded.

Senator Ontiveros presented the eleventh amendment and provided a rationale.

Guidelines Page 21 - External Evaluators

- All letters received in response to solicitation must be included in their entirety if the letters arrive in time for consideration by the Department APT Review Committee.
- Letters in a foreign language must be accompanied by an English translation.
- Each letter should clearly indicate whether the evaluator was **nominated selected** by the candidate, or by the committee.
- Dossier preparation and evaluation is facilitated if letters from external evaluators are sent as searchable electronic attachments.
- **At each stage of the review process, APT voters should be reminded that declines or non-answers to email solicitations shall not be construed as substantive comment on the candidate's tenure case. This guideline is especially important in cases involving research in new or interdisciplinary fields, or fields involving the study of underrepresented groups, as there are often a fewer number of full professors available to write.**

The motion to amend the report was seconded.

Senator Goodman, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, presented the twelfth amendment and a rationale.

Guidelines Page 20 - External Evaluators

The Committee must include a list of all the evaluators to whom a ~~formal~~ request was sent, even if the evaluators do not reply or decline to write. Copies of the letters (or emails) of refusal **to availability requests and official requests** must be included in the dossier. Verbal communications will not be accepted, and any prejudicial discussion regarding ~~declines or~~ non-answers is discouraged. **Evaluative information (negative or positive) provided with any written communication may be considered. However, information provided by evaluators who decline without access to the candidate's materials provided by the Department should be given lesser weight than written responses provided by official evaluators who have accepted the invitation and been provided access to the candidate's official materials for promotion and/or tenure.** In the log, the initial date that the evaluator was contacted should be included, when candidate materials were sent (if different from initial) and the date of response (either when the evaluation was received or the reviewer declined to review)....

The motion to amend the report was seconded.

Hatfield responded that the task force's recommendation was that declines to

formal requests could be interpreted but not declines to initial requests for availability.

Chair Webster opened the floor to discussion of the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth amendments; hearing none he called for a vote on the tenth amendment. The result was 46 in favor, 32 opposed, and 14 abstentions. **The amendment passed.**

Chair Webster called for a vote on the eleventh amendment. The result was 43 in favor, 37 opposed, and 16 abstentions. **The amendment passed.**

Chair Webster called for a vote on the twelfth amendment. The result was 52 in favor, 38 opposed, and 9 abstentions. **The amendment passed.**

Senator Goodman stated that senators could not pick both options. He stated that either we do not consider declines or each discipline decides whether or not to consider them.

Roberta Rudnick, member of the Task Force, clarified that all declines have to be included or not included but reviewers could not pick and choose.

Steven Marcus, member of the Task Force, stated that he supported Senator Goodman's amendment.

Senator Goodman clarified that senators could not vote in favor of all three amendments but rather one or the other.

Because all three amendments passed but conflicted, Chair Webster called for a motion to resolve the votes.

Senator Goodman, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, made a motion to vote on all three amendments at the same time with the first option for amendments 10 & 11, the second option for 12, the third option for neither, and a fourth option of abstain.

The motion was seconded. Chair Webster opened the floor to discussion of the motion.

Senator O'Meara introduced Juan Uriagereka, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, who stated that we could vote on 10 & 11, 12, or neither.

Senator Delwiche, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, Natural Sciences, stated that he did not believe that the three amendments were incompatible. The examples provided by Senator Goodman were evaluative. He believes that voting concludes that those types of evaluative declines can be considered by

the committee but must be down-weighted. He does not think that any further action is required.

Senator Blair, part-time Graduate Student, suggested that if amendment 10 did not include “positive” the amendments could all work together.

Senator Davis, faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering, stated that he did not believe that any further action was necessary. He did not believe that positive or negative declines should be included because the rationale is simply that an evaluator did not have enough time to submit a formal evaluation of the candidate.

Laura Rosenthal, member of the Task Force, stated that the Task Force recognized that including declines could be damaging when considering faculty in emerging fields.

Senator O’Meara, faculty, College of Education, stated that the Task Force’s recommendation was created to remove the noise of why someone declined. She stated that amendments ten and eleven strengthen the task force’s recommendations.

Webster reminded senators that there were additional amendments pending and the meeting was scheduled to end at 5:00 p.m.

Webster called for a vote on the motion. The result was 44 in favor of 10 & 11, 24 in favor of 12, 15 opposed, and 11 abstentions. **Amendments 10 & 11 passed.**

Chair Webster invited Senator Hurtt to present the thirteenth amendment.

Senator Hurtt, faculty, School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation, presented his amendment and provided a rationale.

Research, Scholarship, Creative **and/or Professional** Activity.

The motion to amend the report was seconded.

Hatfield stated that the Task Force’s intention was to recognize professional activity but as a component of scholarship. The term might mean the translation of scholarship, but if professional activity met the benchmarks of peer review, significance, and impact, it could be included. There was also concern over the terminology being related to service in other sections of the document.

Chair Webster recognized Senator Owen, faculty, The Libraries, who made a motion to extend the meeting for 15 minutes in order to complete the discussion. The motion was seconded.

Chair Webster clarified that the motion required a 2/3-majority vote to pass. The result was 72 in favor, 17 opposed, 3 abstentions. **The motion to extend the meeting passed.**

Chair Webster opened the floor to discussion of amendment thirteen.

A senator made a motion to call the question on the amendment. The motion was seconded. Chair Webster opened the floor to discussion of the motion; hearing none, he called for a vote on the motion. The result was 65 in favor, 17 opposed, 8 abstentions. **The motion to call the question passed.**

Chair Webster called for a vote on the thirteenth amendment. The result was 44 in favor, 41 opposed, and 5 abstentions. **The amendment passed.**

Chair Webster invited Senator Belcher to present the fourteenth amendment.

Senator Belcher, undergraduate student, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, presented his amendment and provided a rationale.

APT Policy Page 21 – A. First Level Review 1.

A. First level Review

1. Eligible Voters: At the first level unit of review, the review committee shall consist of all members of the faculty of that unit who are eligible to vote **and one undergraduate student or one graduate student.** To be eligible to vote within the first level unit, the faculty member must hold a tenured appointment in the university and must be at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks appointment or promotion. **To be eligible to vote within the first level unit, the undergraduate or graduate student must be in good academic, financial, and judicial standing with the University and must study within the College or similar institution of the candidate.** Tenured faculty voting on promotions cases at the first level of review may only do so in a single academic department or non-departmentalized school, and may only vote in units in which they have a regular appointment and where this is permitted by the unit's plan of organization. In those cases where a faculty member has the opportunity to vote in more than one department or non-departmentalized school, the faculty member votes in that department/school in which the faculty member holds tenure.

The motion to amend the report was seconded.

Hatfield responded that the USM APT Policy requires peer review by faculty at the same level or higher than the candidate is looking to achieve. He added that the Task Force does highly value inclusiveness and the consideration of students but believe it is crucial to have this experience to make these types of decisions.

Chair Webster opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Senator Fultz, faculty, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, stated that in the University of Maryland Extension there are no undergraduate or graduate students to include in the first-level review.

Senator Baier, undergraduate student, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, stated that he supported the amendment because it could have an immense benefit for the University. The primary job of the faculty is to teach and educate students, so this means that students have a vested interest in the promotion process and should therefore be included.

Senator Baier introduced Charmaine Wilson-Jones, Vice President of Academic Affairs for the Student Government Association (SGA). She stated that the amendment has the full support of the SGA. It is important for students to have a voice so they are a part of the process. It would be unfair to exclude students when a professor's main role is to teach students.

Senator Newburn, faculty, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, stated that when you are being evaluated as an assistant professor, you want the person to have a long history of the profession you are in. Even assistant professors with a background in the field are not allowed to be on the committee. We are evaluated on more than just teaching. He raised concerns about a student's ability to evaluate a faculty member.

Senator O'Meara, faculty, College of Education, introduced Juan Uriagereka, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. He clarified that reviews are only conducted by those up to the level that you are reviewing. Therefore, assistant professors are not included in associate professor reviews. This process goes all the way up to Distinguished University Professor reviews. Voting in favor of this amendment would have consequences for all of those other bodies and is also against USM policy. He urged the Senate to consider those principles when voting on this amendment.

Patrick Ronk, SGA President, submitted the SGA's bill in support of the amendment for the record. He also addressed the concerns about the lack of experience by the students. He emphasized that the language included in the amendment notes that only the best undergraduates chosen by the Provost would be selected for these committees. He noted that not including students denies shared governance.

Senator Salamanca Riba, faculty, A. James School of Engineering, stated that students' input is considered in promotion cases through student evaluations of courses. Student input is considered at all levels but they are not included in the voting process.

Senator Bengfort, graduate student, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, stated that graduate students would be skeptical of serving on these committees because they are often in a professional relationship with their faculty advisors. They would not want to jeopardize their professional careers by making this type of decision. He stated that he opposed the amendment.

Senator Chambers, graduate student, College of Agriculture and Natural Sciences, stated that he was opposed to the amendment. He believed that including students in a process where their own advisors would be up for promotion would introduce bias into the process. Even the highest-level undergraduate student does not have the capability to evaluate faculty at the first or third levels.

Chair Webster called for a vote on the fourteenth amendment. The result was 4 in favor, 82 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The amendment failed.**

Chair Webster recognized Senator Owen, faculty, The Libraries, who made a motion to extend the meeting for 15 minutes in order to complete the discussion. The motion was seconded.

Chair Webster clarified that the motion required a 2/3-majority vote to pass. The result was 64 in favor, 19 opposed, 2 abstentions. **The motion to extend the meeting passed.**

Chair Webster invited Senator Belcher to present the fifteenth amendment. Senator Belcher withdrew the amendment.

Chair Webster opened the floor to any additional amendments.

Senator Belcher presented a sixteenth amendment to include one undergraduate or one graduate student as a non-voting member of the first-level and third-level APT committees.

The motion to amend the report was seconded.

Hatfield asked for clarification of the amendment.

Belcher responded that the amendment would allow student input and a holistic review but would not allow students to alter the vote on a technical level.

Hatfield stated that the task force decided to elevate the evaluation of instruction through the systematic peer reviews and mandatory inclusion of a teaching portfolio because of the impact on students. The principle of requisite experience for these types of reviews is still a major element of the APT process.

Senator Fultz, faculty, College Agriculture and Natural Sciences, reiterated that

UME did not have students to draw from and therefore opposed the amendment.

Chair Webster called for a vote on the sixteenth amendment. The result was 12 in favor, 64 opposed, and 5 abstentions. **The amendment failed.**

Webster opened the floor to discussion of the report as amended; hearing none, he called for a vote of the report as amended. The result was 69 in favor, 4 opposed, and 5 abstentions. **The motion to approve the report as amended passed.**

Chair Webster thanked the task force for its hard work.

New Business

There was no new business.

Adjournment

Senate Chair Webster adjourned the meeting at 5:21 p.m.