

University Senate

November 9, 2011

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 118

Call to Order

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

Approval of the Minutes

Chair Kasischke asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the October 20, 2011 meeting. Hearing none he declared the minutes approved as distributed.

Report of the Chair

Board of Regents Staff Awards

Kasischke reminded the Senate that the deadline for submitting nominations for the Board of Regents Staff Awards is Friday, November 11, 2011. This is an excellent opportunity for our staff to be recognized for the amazing work they do. Information about the nomination process and criteria are listed on the Senate website at <http://www.senate.umd.edu>. He encouraged senators to nominate a staff member.

Special Order of the Day

Wallace D. Loh

President of the University of Maryland, College Park
2011 State of the Campus Address

Overview

President Loh thanked everyone for their support over the last year. The University's rankings are rising: currently 17th amongst all public research universities and 5th amongst all public universities as best value. The success of our university is a result of the collective efforts of faculty, staff, students, and alumni.

Advances in the Last Year

Students are talented and they all love their experience at our University. This is manifested in our recent victory in the solar decathlon. We also recently earned a world record in human-powered flight. Loh also applauded the efforts of students in the recent production of *Rent* and performance of Mozart's *Requiem*.

President Loh stated that he could not list all of the accomplishments of our faculty and students over the last year but gave a few examples of our excellence. We have established seven new major centers that deal with issues such as cyber security, social and environmental issues in sustainability, health, neuroimaging, racial and economic disparities in health delivery, health and information systems, and food safety. We are addressing the grand challenges of the 21st century including issues

of health, national security, environmental sustainability, and quality of life. Faculty successes include numerous awards including the National Science Foundation NSF Career Award, Guggenheim Scholarship, and Fulbright Fellowships etc. He also noted the work of the staff and their value. He assured everyone that his administration is committed to a respectful work environment for everyone. The recent allegations of workplace harassment were addressed by the HR Working Group, and its recommendations were implemented immediately. This includes training of supervisors, English lessons, computer training, and changed appeals process. The alumni contributed over \$100M to the University. He thanked the staff of University Relations for their work raising funds in this difficult economy. Loh stated that one of his biggest challenges was vacancies in numerous administrative positions. Over the last year, we have filled nine vacancies including a new Provost, Vice President for Research, Vice President for Administrative Affairs, Vice President for Information Technology, Chief Diversity Officer, new Deans in CMNS and ARHU, and a new Chief of Staff. We are learning to work as a team and we will move forward. We have also launched four new searches for, the Provost, Vice President for University Relations, Dean of the School of Public Health, and Dean of the School of Journalism. Loh also expressed gratitude to our elected officials in Annapolis. He explained that the meaning of support in this economy is cutting the budget of higher education less than that of other state agencies. They have protected our budget. He stated that furloughs have now disappeared, we have the authority to give staff retention offers, and he will fight for merit increases. As long as the State has a \$1B shortfall, we are still at risk for budget reductions. He is hopeful because our University is an economic engine. For every \$1 invested in faculty/staff salaries, we generate \$3 in external research funding and \$8 of economic activity making us a \$3.4B economic engine for the State. It makes economic sense to invest in the University of Maryland.

Current Economic Conditions

We are facing an economic crisis of global proportion, a magnitude not seen since the Great Depression. We have 25 million Americans who are unemployed or underemployed and a huge national deficit. Our national debt is \$15 Trillion and climbing unless we take action. The Federal Reserve stated "unemployment and slow growth will be the norm for years to come". The State budget is growing by 3%/year in terms of revenue. Our required expenditures exceed the revenue. The only way to address this shortfall is to make cuts or increase revenues (i.e. raise taxes). We will not turn the economic corner for many years to come. Loh quoted Carmen Reinhart who reviewed 400 years of economic history concluded that recessions that are a result of a major financial crisis take 8-10 years to recover. At the Federal level, the most optimistic scenario for NSF, the National Institutes of Health (NIH), and other funding agencies is that federal funding will be flat. The Director of NSF plans to reallocate \$1B of his \$7B budget towards new opportunities. The Governor has frozen tuition for the past three years, but this year allowed a modest increase of 3%. He is committed to keeping higher education affordable. A number of other states have balanced their budgets by increasing tuition drastically.

Looking to the Future-Reinvestment Plan

In order to proceed, we need to follow these principles, increase revenue streams, reductions (fiscal discipline), reallocation, and reinvestment. He announced a major reinvestment plan. The first installment will be \$10M of which \$4M will be invested into educational excellence, \$2M in financial aid to enhance affordability, and \$4M in an innovation fund. Colleges can compete for the innovation fund for interdisciplinary cluster hires on a 1:1 match, innovation and entrepreneurship, and globalization and internationalization.

On the capital side, we will start spending \$10M/year for the foreseeable future in addressing the crumbling infrastructure at the University. We will receive \$5M from the Legislature and another \$5M from floating bonds. We are also advocating for new construction. If we apply State formulas, we are short 1.7M sq. ft., which is roughly 24 buildings. That is equivalent to 80% of the entire campus of the University of Maryland-Baltimore County. That kind of increase has a \$1.5B price tag. We have recently opened a new residence hall and have raised \$10M in private money to build the first teaching and learning center in the last 40 years. We have another new dorm that has been designed and should be opened in a couple years. We are also hoping to announce a significant gift that will allow us to build more facilities.

Intercollegiate Athletics

President Loh addressed the recent budget crisis in the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics. The DIA had been balancing its budget for the last seven years by borrowing from reserves. This is not a long-term solution, which is why he established a commission to help raise revenue, reduce costs, and make reinvestments. The number one priority was the welfare of the student athletes so that they are supported so that they can be successful on the field and in the classroom. The Commission's report is due on November 15, 2011. The Director of Athletics will respond to the report. The Athletic Council and the Senate Executive Committee will also review the recommendations before the President makes the final decision. Hard decisions will have to be made in a fair way according to a careful consideration of the issues and taking into account the advice of the leadership of the Senate and other constituencies.

Community Development

The major challenge to enhancing the excellence of the University is the surrounding community. We need to invest in community development. The biggest issue for parents is student safety. We have to expand concurrent jurisdiction, which will involve negotiation with the City. We need to contribute to enhancing education in the surrounding area. We are in discussion about establishing a charter school. We need to address the issue of transportation with the Purple Line. The Feds have allowed the State's application for the Purple Line to go forward to the engineering and planning stage with the highest marks possible. There may be funds for the Purple Line if President Obama's bill passes. The Purple Line is the most significant decision that he will make because it will impact the livability of this area for the next 50 years. We also need to have a town center, East Campus. It will include a first-class hotel and conference center, subsidized graduate student housing, retail, and upscale restaurants. We are negotiating with developers.

The UMCP/UMB Merger

This merger is an issue that the Board of Regents will make recommendation on by December 15, 2011. The Legislature will make the final decision. There is minimal collaboration with the two schools working independently. The other end of the spectrum is two institutions combined with one president, which could be seen as a hostile takeover. Last fall, our administration met with our counterparts at UMB. We are committed to collaboration. However, since our separation 40 years ago, there has been little to no collaboration. It needs to be formalized to perhaps a strategic alliance where certain areas such as the further development of Shady Grove, tech transfer activities, and investment in certain areas of research that are multi-disciplinary. The fourth option is described as "One Maryland", where there is one flagship with two campuses and two presidents. He does not believe that the status quo is an option and a full merger is also unlikely. The choice is between a strategic alliance and "One Maryland". The difference between the two options is that there are still two universities in the strategic alliance option where the "One Maryland" option has one combined university. If you are one university, with two campuses and two presidents, you can aggregate data and research results relevant to rankings between both institutions. That would place us in the top 10 of all universities in the country. Rankings are important because prospective students pay attention to this. We will be able to attract a larger percentage of the top students in Maryland. We will be able to paint ourselves as a global educational and research powerhouse. Major change, transformative excellence is never easy, speedy, or without controversy, but we must be focused not on what is but what can be in the future. We need vision that catapults both universities to global preeminence, but it will require leadership and perseverance. He stated that we will stick our necks out, we will aim high, we will work hard, we will think big, and we will take risks because that is the way to win the future.

PCC Proposal to Rename the Department of Geography to Geographical Sciences (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-13) (Action)

Elizabeth Beise, Member of the Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee, presented all three proposals to rename the Department, B.S., and M.A. and Ph.D. from Geography to Geographical Sciences to the Senate and provided background information.

Kasischke opened the floor to discussion of the PCC Proposal to Rename the Department of Geography to Geographical Sciences; hearing none, he called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 93 in favor, 4 opposed, and 2 abstentions.
The motion to approve the proposal passed.

PCC Proposal to Rename the B.S. in Geography to Geographical Sciences (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-14) (Action)

Kasischke opened the floor to discussion of the PCC Proposal to Rename the B.S. in Geography to Geographical Sciences; hearing none, he called for a vote on the

proposal. The result was 89 in favor, 5 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to Rename the M.A. and Ph. D. in Geography to Geographical Sciences (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-15) (Action)

Kasischke opened the floor to discussion of the PCC Proposal to Rename the M.A. and Ph. D. in Geography to Geographical Sciences; hearing none, he called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 90 in favor, 5 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to Establish a Master of Arts Program in Second Language Acquisition (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-16) (Action)

Elizabeth Beise, Member of the Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the two proposals to establish a Master of Arts Program and Graduate Certificate in Second Language Acquisition to the Senate and provided background information.

Kasischke opened the floor to discussion of the PCC Proposal to Establish a Master of Arts Program in Second Language Acquisition; hearing none, he called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 89 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to Establish a Graduate Certificate in Second Language Acquisition (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-17) (Action)

Kasischke opened the floor to discussion of the PCC Proposal to Establish a Graduate Certificate in Second Language Acquisition; hearing none, he called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 90 in favor, 3 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to Establish a New Master and Doctoral Program in Higher Education, Student Affairs, and International Education Policy (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-18) (Action)

Elizabeth Beise, Member of the Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the proposal to Establish a New Master and Doctoral Program in Higher Education, Student Affairs, and International Education Policy to the Senate and provided background information.

Kasischke opened the floor to discussion of the PCC Proposal to Establish a New Master and Doctoral Program in Higher Education, Student Affairs, and International Education Policy; hearing none, he called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 92 in favor, 4 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to Change the Name of the Master and Doctoral Programs in Counseling and Personnel Services to Counseling Psychology, School Psychology, and Counselor Education (Senate Doc. No. 11-12-19) (Action)

Elizabeth Beise, Member of the Programs, Curricula, & Courses (PCC) Committee, presented the proposal to Change the Name of the Master and Doctoral Programs in Counseling and Personnel Services to Counseling Psychology, School Psychology, and Counselor Education to the Senate and provided background information.

Kasischke opened the floor to discussion of the PCC Proposal to Change the Name of the Master and Doctoral Programs in Counseling and Personnel Services to Counseling Psychology, School Psychology, and Counselor Education; hearing none, he called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 89 in favor, 3 opposed, and 4 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Proposal to Review the University of Maryland Policies Concerning Academic Transcripts and Calculation of Grade Point Average (Senate Doc. No. 10-11-11) (Action)

Robert Buchanan, Chair of the Academic Procedures & Standards Committee presented the proposal to amend the University of Maryland Policies Concerning Academic Transcripts and Calculation of Grade Point Average to the Senate and provided background information.

Kasischke opened the floor to discussion.

Senator Levy, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, stated that he could not find the effect of this change on our graduate programs in the proposal. The Graduate School has GPA guidelines, which these changes will affect. Individual programs also have specific GPA requirements.

Buchanan invited Provost Wylie to respond. She in turn asked Dean Caramello to explain the Graduate School's review.

Dean Caramello, Graduate School, stated that Appendix 7 of the proposal outlines the impact on the graduate program. It will not affect any individual program with a GPA requirement above 3.0. They will still have that authority. These programs cannot set a requirement below a 3.0. In reviewing grades to graduate students over the last five years, the effect on overall GPA is 0.03 and the effect on number of students who would drop below 3.0 is minimal.

Senator Levy, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, asked if individual graduate programs should revisit their guidelines and adjust them to the new system as part of the implementation plan. There are guidelines where the average of certain courses must be a 3.5, which a student could get with a B and an A-. When this is implemented that will no longer be the case. If our program is happy with a B and an A-, it should be written into the guidelines.

Dean Caramello responded that individual programs can still specify programs in a different way, but this does not affect that ability.

Provost Wylie explained that throughout the University there are requirements at both the undergraduate and graduate levels that are specified by programs. They may require a particular grade in a course in order to proceed in the major or a particular grade or else the course has to be repeated. There are many requirements at the department level. Some are expressed in GPA and some in grades. At the present time the C requirement means a C+, C, or C-. All of the programs are going to have to look over their individual requirements and make a determination about whether or not a C- will satisfy or not. Until those changes are made, we are going to assume that it does. That is the only way that we can move forward with implementation.

Caramello clarified that the only exception is that the requirement cannot drop below a 3.0.

Senator Newhagen, Faculty, College of Journalism, stated that he was Chair of Educational Affairs Committee in 2005 that passed the original policy. He asked whether we would be abandoning the dual system so that there will be one uniform GPA reflecting a plus/minus system on a student's transcript. He also stated that it has taken 15 years to settle this issue.

Buchanan confirmed that that was the intent.

Senator Ellis, Undergraduate, Robert H. Smith School of Business, stated that she and other students were disappointed with the proposal and were not in favor of it. The proposal seems to be geared towards students looking to go to a graduate program. However, it has a negative impact on students going directly into the job market who will be assessed by their GPA. She stated that financial aid requirements have minimum GPA. She sees more negative effects than positive ones with this implementation.

Buchanan stated that the committee looked at the overall effect on GPA, and it had a minor effect. The committee also considered the specific experiences of members in terms of implementation and the reality is that grades are re-calculated to reflect the standard environment across universities when they apply for graduate programs or jobs. He also noted that our current policy is for the weighted system. Because it has not been implemented, we are behind most of the universities in the country.

Senator Tolu, Undergraduate, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, stated that a lot of students are against the implementation plan. Student Government Association (SGA) polls show that a lot of students are against this plan. It is not in the best interest of students. She stated that the fractional change does affect when you are applying to graduate school. The GPA on your transcript is the one that people will look to. When we say that our peers have a similar plan, we are not accounting for the fact that they are more competitive universities than

ours. Our current system is working fine. The percentage of students getting an A+ is very small. This plan is discouraging to students striving for an A and it is just a 3.7. She also voiced concerns that transcripts will show both systems for students who are currently enrolled and how complex that would be. We should only apply this policy to incoming freshman.

Senator Miletich, Undergraduate, College of Arts & Humanities, asked why the 4.3 was being changed to 4.0 for an A+.

Buchanan stated that the 4.3 gives the impression of grade inflation and does not align with our peer institutions.

Senator Miletich, Undergraduate, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that he does not see the point in changing something that is not broken. There are more negative effects in this new plan.

Senator Ahmed, Undergraduate, School of Public Health, stated that he was concerned that we are not taking into account who this policy will impact. Students do not feel as if this plan is in our best interest. We need to consider our benefactors so that they want to come back and contribute to the University. He also stated that when he recalculated his own GPA, it dropped from a 3.54 to a 3.49 under the new plan. He would not have been accepted into certain programs if he had a GPA below 3.49. The .03 is just an average change. He urged the Senate to think about who will be affected.

Kasischke reminded senators that they could only speak again once all others have had the opportunity to speak.

Senator Blagadorskiy, Undergraduate, College of Letters & Sciences, stated that students are not supportive of this plan. He is pending admission into the Business School. His current GPA is 3.21 and he is hoping to get to the 3.5 threshold that is required to get into the program. While the average change in GPA was 0.03, his GPA would have changed by 0.1. He also stated that the uncertainty that this causes for admission into specific programs is unacceptable especially considering the high cost of tuition.

Senator Lathrop, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, stated that while the change in GPA is small, there is a human cost to this change that should be taken into account.

Dean Caramello, Graduate School, stated that it is a long-standing Graduate School policy to allow programs to make exceptions for students placed on probation. This is a routine practice.

Dean Hamilton, Undergraduate Studies, stated that there was a failure of will to make the change that was in the best interest of the University in 2005 when the original policy was created. Many of us have lamented that a change that needed to be made was not made. There will be a period of transition especially for people in

the C category. It is important that we benchmark and align with our peers. We should not be behind or have grade inflation. It is important for us to give students who want to achieve the extra point they deserve over people who did not bother. She also noted that other institutions like Virginia Tech, the University of Connecticut, the University of Florida, the University of Texas-Austin, the University of Washington, and the University of Minnesota all use similar plus/minus grading systems. Several other universities also use plus/minus grading.

Provost Wylie stated that she has been involved with this issue for many years. She noted the concern by our current students about going back and recalculating their GPA based upon this new scale. She clarified that there will be no change in any GPA that has been earned to date. Changes will only be applied to grades going forward. She believes that this new grading system will change behavior. You cannot apply an analogy by just going backwards because people know that a B- is the same as a B so why bother to do the extra work. It is an unfair criticism of the policy. We should look at the opportunity that it gives faculty to recognize the achievements of students.

Senator Fagan, Undergraduate, Robert H. Smith School of Business, introduced Elizabeth Moran to speak. Moran stated that she is currently a business student. She prefaced her comments by saying that she comes from a perspective as a student who works hard. She stated that most of her grades are low A's because that is what is feasible and reasonable. This plan is only negative. She does not believe that the majority of students even know about the policy change due to a lack of transparency in the process. Students have planned their academic careers based on the current system. She stated that she would not have taken her easiest classes her first year if she knew that she would have to get pluses in her last year. She would have spread her classes out more. It is a switch-up that she does not appreciate.

Buchanan commented on the issues about transparency by stating that this is not a new policy but rather just a matter of implementation of existing policy. The only change is to make the A+ from a 4.3 to a 4.0. It has been vetted for over 15 years. As a new professor, he spent a lot of time trying to give students the grade that they deserved only to discover that it did not count. This has been a long-standing transparent process.

Kaiyi Xie, Non-Voting Ex-Officio, SGA President, stated that the rationale for moving to the new system is not supported by studies in scientific journals. From his research he stated that studies show that student behavior did not change, and there was no statistical change in student motivation or performance in classes at an institution that made this switch. If student behavior is not modified, what is the end result. As to the question of whether this new plan changes faculty behavior, he believes that it is unfair to students who have already been here for several years if that is the case. There is no evidence of faculty behavior changes in the report. If faculty behavior does not change then the argument of behavior modification is moot. We already give the students that put in more effort that extra point because the plus on their transcript can be recalculated. We are not denying those who

received the plus the right to be recognized for their achievement because they are already recognized for their extra achievement. What is different is the numerical translation of that plus into what we have today. How does GPA correlate to your grade? He believes that a grade is not the problem, but the impact of the transition period is not reflected in the proposal. It is not fair to students who are in the old system 50% of the time and in the new 50% of the time because they have planned their academic careers around this system. There is discussion about standardizing because our peers do so but no talk about the impact of not standardizing our current policy. There is nothing that shows that we are hurt or penalized by our current system to justify making a change. We still have differentiation amongst our students. The proposal does not show that keeping the current system hurts student performance or our chances of admission into graduate programs or future jobs. That is a question that remains to be addressed by this implementation plan. He also inquired about the number of senators needed for a quorum.

Kasischke responded that the quorum for today's meeting was 61.

Xie made a motion to recommit the proposal to the APAS Committee to study the issue further and garner student input on the implementation plan. The motion was seconded.

Kasischke stated that in the interest of time, he would like to move to a vote on the motion.

Zach Cohen called for a point of order that the motion was debatable.

Marvin Breslow, Parliamentarian, agreed that the motion was debatable.

Kasischke opened the floor to discussion of the motion to recommit the proposal to the APAS Committee for further consideration. He also reminded the Senate that the meeting must end at 5:15 p.m. unless a motion to extend the meeting was approved.

Cohen inquired whether there was an objection to the motion to recommit.

Kasischke clarified that we are merely opening the floor to discussion of the motion to recommit.

Martha Nell Smith, Chair-Elect, made a motion to call the question and end debate on the motion to recommit. The motion was seconded.

Kasischke called for a vote on the motion to call the question and end debate on the motion to recommit the proposal to the committee. The result was 52 in favor, 22 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to call the question passed.**

Kasischke stated that we must now move to a vote on the motion to recommit the proposal to the committee. The result was 35 in favor, 41 opposed, and 1 abstention. **The motion to recommit the proposal to the committee failed.**

Martha Nell Smith, Chair-Elect, made a motion to call the question and end debate on the APAS Committee's proposal. She further stated that students are being hurt by the fact that our current policy is not being implemented. Grade recalculations do occur in business and graduate school. The motion was seconded.

Cohen asked for a point of personal privilege and requested that he be allowed to express the views of his constituents.

Marvin Breslow, Parliamentarian, stated that the motion to call the question is not debatable.

Kasischke called for a vote on the motion to call the question and end debate on the APAS Committee's proposal. The result was 67 in favor, 8 opposed, and 0 abstentions. **The motion to call the question passed.**

Kasischke stated that we must now move to a vote on the APAS Committee's proposal. The result was 49 in favor, 26 opposed, and 2 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Chair Kasischke adjourned the meeting because we had reached the end of the announced time for the meeting, 5:15 p.m.

The remaining two action items on the agenda will be placed on the agenda for the December 8, 2011 Senate Meeting.