

University Senate

October 9, 2014

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 78

Call to Order

Senate Chair Webster called the meeting to order at 3:19 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

Chair Webster asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the September 17, 2014 meeting. Hearing none, he declared the minutes approved as distributed.

Report of the Chair

Nominations Committee

Webster stated that outgoing Senators should have received a message from the Senate Office requesting volunteers to serve on the Nominations Committee. This important committee is charged with soliciting nominations from the membership of the Senate for the Executive Committee, Chair-Elect, the Committee on Committees, and other University-wide committees and councils whose members will be elected at the annual transition of the Senate in May. The Committee serves a very important purpose yet meets only a few times during the period of late-January through March. The Senate relies on the good judgment of the members of the Nominations Committee to present candidates that reflect the quality and diversity of our campus community. Webster encouraged any outgoing senators to consider serving on this important committee. Those interested can send an email to senate-admin@umd.edu. The Senate will vote on the Nominations Committee slate at its December meeting.

Next Meeting

Webster announced that the next Senate meeting would be held on Wednesday, November 5, 2014. President Loh will be presenting his State of the Campus Address. This meeting will be held in the Colony Ballroom of the Union to accommodate the larger audience that is anticipated.

Updates

Webster stated that the Senate had considered several parallel revisions of the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Policy including one of the items we will review today. The Senate approved Providing a Unified Framework for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Appointments (Senate Doc. No. 12-13-55) last spring. This revision created a new framework for NTT faculty and new titles. We were just notified that the Chancellor has approved these new titles. Because it had not yet received final approval, those revisions are not reflected in the version of the policy that is currently before the Senate. In addition, the Senate approved the APT Policy and Guidelines

recommendations that were considered at the last meeting. He assured senators that we would ensure that all approved changes are merged into the final version of the policy.

Convocation Awardees

Webster noted that past senators and committee chairs Steve Petkas and Marcia Marinelli and past senate chairs Linda Mabbs and S. James Gates were honored at the Faculty and Staff Convocation.

Field Hockey Game

Webster announced that Senator Meharg would be leading the #2 Women's Field Hockey team against #4 Penn State University on Friday, October 10, 2014 at 3:30 p.m. at the Lacrosse/Field Hockey Complex. He encouraged senators to attend the game and cheer on the team.

Consideration of an Overall Title for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (Senate Doc. No. 12-13-56) (Action)

Devin Ellis, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, presented the committee's recommendations and provided background information.

Webster opened the floor to discussion of the motion.

Senator Hurtt, faculty, School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation, stated that he sympathized with the committee's approach to the problem. He stated that at the last senate meeting, he introduced an amendment to include "professional activity" as an element of scholarship in our APT documents. He stated that the term "professional-track" introduces ambiguity because of this recent change to scholarship. He stated that the Senate could delay consideration of "professional-track" and reconsider the term "specialized" or "specialty-track" instead.

Webster asked if Senator Hurtt wanted to make a motion. Hurtt responded that he did not wish to make an amendment at this time.

Ellin Scholnick, Past Chair and current member of the Faculty Affairs Committee, stated that there is a limited semantic domain and that there would be a little overlap no matter what option was used and this option has the least overlap. Ellis stated that even though there are research and instructional faculty it does not imply that tenured/tenure-track faculty do not do research or instruction. The term professional-track is being used to define people that are not on the tenure-track but does not imply that tenure-track faculty do not have professional accomplishments. He drew an analogy to professional degree programs that are not intended to move into tenure-track in academic position.

Senator Zambrana, faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, introduced Marsha Rozenblit, Professor of History, to speak. Rozenblit stated that she finds the term

“professional-track” problematic. She stated that she does not see a correlation to professional degree programs because they are not associated with the academic world. She raised concerns about the implication that tenured/tenure-track faculty are not professional. She suggested that the term “adjunct” was more appropriate.

Ellis stated that the term “adjunct” has a specific definition in the University System of Maryland (USM) policy for part-time faculty members under 50% FTE.

Rozenblit inquired who would be included in the professional-track faculty, only 100% faculty?

Ellis stated that adjunct faculty would also be included in the professional-track faculty title along with instructional, research, and clinical faculty who hold appointments of 50% or more.

Dean Ball, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, inquired about the lecturer track and the rationale for not using teaching professor.

Scholnick responded that there was a concern about calling people “professor” because of the overlap with the tenure-track faculty.

Juan Uriagereka, Member of the Faculty Affairs Committee & Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, stated that the term “American” applied to citizens of the United States does not imply that those born in the American continent are not American. He clarified that the fact that there are research professors does not imply that tenure-track faculty do not conduct research. This same logic can be applied to professional-track, clinical etc.

Senator Blair, part-time graduate student, stated that she supports the proposal but noted that the concerns for the term “professional-track” does not imply that other faculty are not professional.

Webster called for a vote on the motion. The result was 61 in favor, 12 opposed, and 4 abstentions. **The motion passed.**

Clarification of University APT Policy Regarding Emeritus Status for Research Faculty (Senate Doc. No. 12-13-42) (Action)

Devin Ellis, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, presented the committee’s recommendations and provided background information.

Webster opened the floor to discussion of the motion.

Webster invited Juan Uriagereka, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and member of the Faculty Affairs Committee to provide perspective on potential implementation in light of the recent approval of the new NTT framework.

Uriagereka stated that the new NTT titles now exist. The Provost is meeting with the Senate chairs to develop an implementation plan. There could be a situation where someone retires this spring but is not at the principal lecturer level. Those types of situations can be dealt with on an ad hoc basis as they arise. The present policy explicitly states that there must be meritorious service in one of the three dimensions of scholarship. This creates an asymmetry because tenure-track faculty are in three dimensions. While the NTT faculty are only allowed to attain emeritus status at the top-tier but not the tenure-track faculty. The requirement for both is still meritorious service, so you still have to achieve the top tier in both cases. In one instance, you must do it through the track you are in, whereas in others you may excel in a couple of tiers but not the third.

Senator Boyle, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, stated that he is enthusiastic about the opportunity to upgrade opportunities for our NTT faculty. They are an important part of our University. The emeritus designation does not cost a lot but it is a meaningful recognition. The proposal could be improved if emeritus status was awarded to the top two tiers of NTT faculty. He feels that the asymmetry diminishes the NTT faculty without cause. He commented on the rigorous process for NTT faculty in his college. He made a motion to amend the recommendations to include second-tier non-tenure track faculty (noted in pink). The motion was seconded.

7. Emerita, Emeritus

The word emerita or emeritus after an academic title shall designate a faculty member who has retired from full-time employment in the University of Maryland at College Park after meritorious service to the University in the areas of teaching, research, or service. Emerita or emeritus status may be conferred on Associate Professors, Professors, Distinguished University Professors, ~~Research Associate Professors, Research Professors,~~ Senior Agents, Principal Agents, Librarians III, ~~and Librarians IV,~~ **Professors of the Practice, Associate Research Professors, Research Professors, Associate Research Scientists, Research Scientists, Associate Research Scholars, Research Scholars, Associate Research Engineers, Research Engineers, Associate Artists-in-Residence, Artists-in-Residence, Senior Agent Associates, Principal Agent Associates, Associate Clinical Professors, Clinical Professors, Senior Lecturers, Principal Lecturers, Senior Faculty Specialists, and Principal Faculty Specialists.**

G. Procedures Governing the Granting of Emerita/Emeritus Status

1. Associate Professors, Professors, Distinguished University Professors, ~~Research Associate Professors, Research Professors,~~ Senior Agents, Principal Agents, Librarians III, ~~and Librarians IV,~~ **Professors of the Practice, Associate Research**

Professors, Research Professors, Associate Research Scientists, Research Scientists, Associate Research Scholars, Research Scholars, Associate Research Engineers, Research Engineers, Associate Artists-in-Residence, Artists-in-Residence, Senior Agent Associates, Principal Agent Associates, Associate Clinical Professors, Clinical Professors, Senior Lecturers, Principal Lecturers, Senior Faculty Specialists, and Principal Faculty Specialists, who have been members of the faculty of the University of Maryland at College Park for **the equivalent of** ten or more years **of full-time service**, and who give to their chair or dean proper written notice of their intention to retire, are eligible for nomination to emerita/emeritus status (see I.E.7 Emerita, Emeritus). Only in exceptional circumstances may **Professors faculty** with fewer than **the equivalent of** ten years of **full-time** service to the institution be recommended for emerita/emeritus status.

Webster opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Scholnick responded that the committee's proposal is conservative because of the new framework. The committee decided to provide it for the top tier but decided to make the distinction on the second tier because we do not know how the system will work or be implemented.

Senator Goodman, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, stated that he supported the amendment in the context of research faculty. Research faculty at the second tier go through a rigorous process and are often not promoted to the top tier because their faculty mentor does not get around to it not because they are not meritorious. We should not evaluate faculty based on the category but rather on whether they are meritorious.

Ellis responded that he is sympathetic to the idea in the amendment. He noted that the points made by Senators Goodman and Boyle was valid. He applauded CMNS for its support but noted that it is not systematic throughout the institution. The rationale for doing this process by category is because we do not have a systematic track record in which to evaluate how rigorously those in the second tier have been evaluated up to this point. There are still units that have not allowed NTT faculty to move to the second tier. The new titles series will allow meritorious faculty to be promoted regardless of the motivation of their mentors. Each unit will have to develop written and approved guidelines for professional track faculty. For now, we need to recognize the meritorious faculty at the top tier.

Uriagereka agreed with Ellis and stated that the new policy is designed to prevent Senator Goodman's example. We need to evaluate meritorious accomplishments and decide what conditions this occurs. The proposal focuses on the top-tier. In the tenure-track it is not just the top tier because you could be meritorious in one dimension and not the others, but that is not an entitlement. We need to decide on the larger principle of whether emeritus status should be granted for meritorious accomplishments. If it is based on merit, it cannot go beyond the top-tier because it will affect all categories of NTT faculty.

Jim McKinney, full-time instructor, supported the amendment and the original proposal. For symmetry purposes the amendment makes sense and gives respect to NTT faculty. In the Business School, there are a lot of criteria to achieve the second-tier. In schools where the criteria are not established, people are not being promoted.

Christopher Davis, faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering, stated that he sympathized with the intent of the amendment but opposed it. We need to clean up how we move faculty through the ranks. If you are meritorious, you should be at the top level. He made an analogy to associate professors that do not make it to professor because they have not excelled in all three dimensions but are still at the level for meritorious in one dimension. There is a distinction between faculty that have to excel in all three dimensions to get to the rank of professors and professional track faculty that only have to be meritorious in one dimension.

Senator Goodman, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, stated that we have not yet cleaned up the system and in the meantime, they cannot receive emeritus status. If we evaluate on merit, the rank should be irrelevant. There currently is no one in the top tier.

Uriagereka responded that the title exists but we just have to activate it.

Goodman responded that merit should be criteria and we should leave it to the faculty to judge merit. We should revise the system but we should not restrict access in the meantime.

Ellis responded that he agreed with not waiting until full implementation but we should not develop a policy based on what we will have to do in the transition period. The committee wants to establish a policy that allows for the system to be implemented and then revisit the policy in the future. There will be some ad hoc cases during that transition period.

Uriagereka stated that we could assign emeritus titles retroactively. It will be faster to move faculty from senior lecturer to principle lecturer than it will be to move to emeritus.

Sabrina Baron, part-time instructor, asked for a clarification on the term “full-time” and whether it was 100% FTE? She also asked for clarification on the eligibility requirement of “ten or more years.”

Scholnick clarified that eligibility is based on the “equivalent” of 10 years. Ellis stated that all of the service is totaled towards the 10 years of eligibility. The 10-year language comes from System policy for emeritus status.

Baron stated that she did not feel that the correlation with associate professors held up because it is difficult for professional track faculty to excel in the other dimensions like research and teaching.

Webster reminded senators that discussion should be based on the amendment.

Senator Kaplan, faculty, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, stated that assistant professors are voted up or down, so the lowest level of tenure track faculty is associate professor. He inquired about the cost and benefits associated with emeritus status and stated that if the cost is not great we should include the second-tier for eligibility.

Scholnick stated that the cost is free parking and access to university services like the library etc.

Hearing no further discussion, Webster called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 35 in favor, 33 opposed, and 4 abstentions. **The amendment passed.**

Webster opened the floor to discussion of the proposal as amended.

Hearing no further discussion, Webster called for a vote on the proposal as amended. The result was 51 in favor, 20 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The amended proposal passed.**

New Business

There was no new business.

Adjournment

Senate Chair Webster adjourned the meeting at 4:20 p.m.