

December 3, 2009

MEMORANDUM

TO: University Senate Members

FROM: Elise Miller-Hooks
Chair of the University Senate

SUBJECT: University Senate Meeting on Thursday, December 10, 2009

The next meeting of the University Senate will be held on Thursday, December 10, 2009. The meeting will convene at **3:30 p.m.**, in **Room 0106, Francis Scott Key Hall**. If you are unable to attend, please contact the Senate Office¹ by calling 301-405-5805 or sending an email to senate-admin@umd.edu for an excused absence. Your response will assure an accurate quorum count for the meeting.

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

Meeting Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the November 12, 2009, Senate Minutes (Action)
3. Report of the Chair
4. Reports of a Committee:
 - Committee on Committees Report: Nominations Committee Slate (Senate Document Number 09-10-20) (Action)
 - Faculty Affairs Committee Report on a Proposed Policy and Procedures for Part-Time Status of Tenured and Tenure-Track Due to Childrearing Responsibilities (Senate Document Number 09-10-21) (Action)
5. Report of a Taskforce:
 - Update from the General Education Taskforce by Ira Berlin (Information)
6. New Business
 - Wooded Hillock Resolution (Senate Document Number 09-10-23) (Action) - <http://savethehillock.com/>
7. Adjournment

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

University Senate

November 12, 2009

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 120

Call to Order

Senate Chair Miller-Hooks called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

Chair Miller-Hooks asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the September 16, 2009 meeting. Hearing none she declared the minutes approved as distributed.

Report of the Chair

Chair Miller-Hooks gave updates since the last Senate meeting in September.

General Education Task Force

- Miller-Hooks gave an overview of the I-Series Courses. She explained how the task force developed and piloted the program. 20 proposals were chosen out of 50 submitted and a reception to announce those selected was held on October 19th. Information about the courses and instructors can be found at: <http://www.provost.umd.edu/GenEd2009>. The pilot will be expanded to 40 courses by 2010-2011 with the ultimate goal of 80 courses being offered each semester. A new RFP will be issued in December to allow colleges and departments the ability to participate in the vetting process.
- Miller-Hooks explained that the task force is now focusing on other elements including Distributive Studies, Fundamental Studies and a new category involving “Scholarship in Practice” or “Applied Knowledge”.
- Miller-Hooks explained that the task force’s next steps will involve Diversity, Experiential/Experimental Learning and a possible requirement in oral communications. The task force expects to bring a draft of their plan to the Senate in February or March.

Task Force on Faculty Merit Pay

- Miller-Hooks explained that the SEC had charged the Faculty Affairs Committee with reviewing the implementation of the existing faculty merit review process. The committee began to work on this item and noted that the policy calls for, “a task force jointly appointed by the President and the Senate to evaluate the effectiveness of these recommendations.”

- Miller-Hooks explained that the SEC and the President's offices have decided to take this item off the Faculty Affairs Committee's agenda and have now created a presidential/senate task force to look at this item. We have agreed on membership for this task force. Eric Kasischke, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, has agreed to chair the task force. The committee will also consist of 4 members of the Faculty Affairs Committee. The complete list of members includes: Ritu Agarwal (BMGT), Jordan Goodman (CMPS), Robert Jackson (AGNR), Sally Koblinsky (President's Office/SPH), Courtland Lee (EDUC), Zita Nunes (ARHU), Art Popper (CLFS), Ellin Scholnick (Provost's Office/BSOS), Elisabeth Smela (ENGR).

Wooded Hillock

- Miller-Hooks gave background information about the proposal from Professor Marla McIntosh about the relocation of campus operations to the Wooded Hillock as part of the East Campus Relocation Project.
- Miller-Hooks gave a timeline of how the proposal was considered by the Senate, including a discussion of the SEC on September 3, 2009 and a charge to the Campus Affairs Committee with a deadline of October 26, 2009. She also explained that the committee reported back by the deadline along with a minority report. The SEC voted to prepare a letter to: (1) continue to examine ways in which the impact on the Wooded Hillock might be reduced and (2) consider the value of the Wooded Hillock as an educational forest and analyze the impact of a reduction in acreage on that value. The SEC will also create an ad-hoc committee of the University Senate to look into the decision-making process regarding the current practice of site selection for campus construction projects. The committee will be small and neutral. Jerry Miller has already agreed to Chair the committee. Willie Brown will be the staff representative and Brent Finagin will serve as the undergraduate representative. A charge has been drafted and will be approved by the SEC. The committee should be moving forward in a couple of weeks.
- Miller-Hooks also explained that we are expecting a motion for a resolution regarding the Wooded Hillock under New Business. She urged the Senators to remain through New Business.

Protocols

- Miller-Hooks explained the protocols of Senate Meetings. She stated that only Senators may speak, but a Senator may introduce a non-senator to speak.
- Miller-Hooks also explained that speakers must wait until all others who wish to speak have had an opportunity before speaking again. She requested that all speakers should state their name, constituency and college.

Clickers

- Miller-Hooks explained that the Senate would be moving to an electronic voting system by using clickers.

- Miller-Hooks informed the Senate that we would do a quick test of the clickers before using them for an actual vote.

Spring Senate Meeting Schedule

- Miller-Hooks explained that the spring 2010 Senate schedule has been finalized and called the Senate's attention to the dates on the slide: February 3, 2010, March 3, 2010, April 8, 2010, April 22, 2010 and May 5, 2010.
- Miller-Hooks announced that the meetings would again be held in 0200 Skinner but would remain from 3:30p.m.-5:15p.m.

Committee Reports

**PCC Proposal to Rename the B.S. in “Kinesiological Sciences” to
“Kinesiology” (Senate Document Number 09-10-09) (Action)**

Alex Chen, Chair of the Programs, Curricula and Courses Committee, presented the proposal to the Senate and provided background information. Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion; hearing none, she called for a vote of the Senate. The result was unanimous in favor of the proposal. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

**PCC Proposal to Rename the Area of Concentration of “Physiology” to
“Physiological Systems” in the Ph.D. in Biological Sciences (Senate
Document Number 09-10-10) (Action)**

Alex Chen, Chair of the Programs, Curricula and Courses Committee, presented the proposal to the Senate and provided background information. Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion; hearing none, she called for a vote of the Senate. The result was unanimous in favor of the proposal. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

**PCC Proposal to Discontinue the M.A. in Comparative Literature (Senate
Document Number 09-10-19) (Action)**

Alex Chen, Chair of the Programs, Curricula and Courses Committee, presented the proposal to the Senate and provided background information. Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion; hearing none, she called for a vote of the Senate. The result was unanimous in favor of the proposal. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

**ERG Committee Report-Revisions to the Senate Bylaws 2009-2010 (Senate
Document Number 09-10-06) (Action)**

Kendra Wells, Chair of the Elections, Representation and Governance Committee, presented the proposal to the Senate and provided background information. Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion.

Senator Arthur Johnson, Faculty, College of Engineering, asked that the language on CUSF membership be amended to include a ranking of the alternates and when this begins.

Wells responded that current practice is to put a call out to both alternates and whoever can attend, will.

Reka Montfort, Executive Secretary & Director, explained that this language is being changed due to a change in the number of alternates given by CUSF and that a ranking was not included in that membership. She advised him to offer an amendment if he believes that the language should be altered.

Marvin Breslow, Parliamentarian, suggested an amendment in which the alternates would be ranked by the number of votes received. Senator Johnson accepted this to be the wording for his amendment.

Miller-Hooks called for a vote of the amendment. The amendment passed unanimously.

Miller-Hooks called for a vote of the Senate. The result was a majority in favor of the proposal. **The amended motion to approve the proposal passed.**

ERG Committee Report-Part-Time Graduate Student Representation (Senate Document Number 09-10-11) (Action)

Kendra Wells, Chair of the Elections, Representation and Governance Committee, presented the proposal to the Senate and provided background information. Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion.

Senator Arthur Johnson, Faculty, College of Engineering, asked if people could run under multiple constituencies if they are both part-time graduate students and staff.

Miller-Hooks explained that there is precedence in that students with double-majors have the option of choosing in which college they would like to run.

Miller-Hooks called for a vote of the Senate. The result was a majority in favor of the proposal. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

APAS Committee Report-30-Credit Hour Rule (Senate Document Number 07-08-14) (Action)

Charles Delwiche, Chair of the Academic Procedures and Standards Committee, presented the proposal to the Senate and provided background information. He explained that the committee evaluated the residency requirement which ensures

that anyone receiving a degree from the University takes a maximum number of courses here. The rule stipulates that the final 30 credits must be taken at the University. This stipulation hurts students who want to study-abroad or get involved in internships. The revised policy accounts for these options.

Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion; hearing none, she called for a vote of the Senate. The result was unanimous in favor of the proposal. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Special Order of the Day
Nariman Farvardin
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost
Ann Wylie
Vice President for Administrative Affairs
Overview of the Decision-Making Process for Budget Reductions

Chair Miller-Hooks introduced Provost Farvardin.

Background

Provost Farvardin gave background information on the budget reductions we have received so far and explained that we anticipate further cuts either in the current fiscal year or the next. He explained that we started FY10 with a budget shortfall of approximately 2 ½ percent. In the middle of July, additional shortfalls in the State's revenue were announced, and we were asked to prepare for additional budget cuts. Chancellor Kirwan informed the University System of Maryland (USM) Presidents that they must accelerate planning efforts in preparation for significant programmatic reductions or eliminations in campus operations. He also added that we must protect core operations that support students and their degree programs and high-quality research programs. The first round of cuts occurred in July, the second in late August, a third was in the form of a mandate for furloughs and a fourth in October. These budget reductions total approximately \$40M for the University. The breakdown was approximately \$10M in furloughs, some in base, and some in one time funds. He explained that the specifics were explained at the Budget Town Hall meeting by the President.

Process

Provost Farvardin gave an overview of the process implemented within the Division of Academic Affairs. Initially, he called an emergency meeting of the deans in July and asked them to work with their leadership teams and constituencies of their colleges to develop a plan in anticipation of budget cuts. The same process was implemented in the Provost's office units. In developing these plans, they decided to abandon the concept of across-the-board cuts and preserve the programs essential to the core mission of the University and those that bring excellence and reputation to the institution. The decision was also made to protect staff positions and preserve all faculty positions, tenured or tenure-track. In each plan, the deans were asked to identify programs that are most important to the mission, as well as those that are

excellent. They were then asked to propose budget cuts that would affect the core programs minimally or not at all and other programs more drastically, including elimination. The Deans interacted with their own constituencies and the Provost while developing their plans.

Principles

The Provost explained that he applied a few major principles in determining how the budget cuts would be accomplished. The overriding principle was to protect academic programs and excellence of programs in education and research. Another principle was to ensure that the budget cuts would not have a severe negative impact on the budgets that support graduate students. The final principle was to ensure that we did not have too large an impact on the staff and minimize layoffs.

Timeline

The deans and associate provosts submitted their plans for budget reductions in mid-September. The Academic Planning Advisory Committee (APAC), consisting of all constituencies, met on October 1, 2009. In that meeting, they repeated discussion of process and performed a detailed analysis of the overall budget situation and the impact of the cuts. On October 12th, APAC held their second meeting. By that time, the Provost had reviewed and analyzed all of the submitted plans and consulted his administration, the Deans, and the president in order to make some preliminary decisions. The preliminary plan was presented at a meeting of APAC, where the members considered a significant number of the highlights. There was significant discussion about the reorganization of enrollment services, elimination of support for the Center for Leadership and Organizational Change and a number of other decisions that were of no significant academic impact in the College of Agriculture & Natural Resources, the College of Arts & Humanities, the School of Business & Management, the College of Computers, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, the College of Life Sciences, the College of Engineering, the Libraries, The School of Public Policy, and the School of Public Health. In addition, a number of proposals for budget reductions had academic implications. These changes will be vetted with APAC even before the final proposals are submitted. These proposals include changes to programs in the College of Arts & Humanities, the College of Agriculture & Natural Resources and the School of Public Health. The deans and associate deans appeared before APAC and gave independent presentations of their plans and provided a status report in anticipation of a formal proposal. APAC held their next meeting on October 26th, where the Dean of the College of Education presented a significant plan of a major reorganization of the college. This decision was not exclusively motivated by budget cuts but rather to improve the college as a whole. All of the proposals discussed with APAC thus far have received strong support. Most proposals are in their preliminary stages. APAC should receive some formal proposals in the next 2-3 weeks. There will be two more meetings of APAC this semester and many more in the spring semester. After completing this process, the Provost also consulted with the president, and then the final decisions were made and communicated.

Final Outcomes

A verbatim tape of the meeting is on file in the Senate Office.

The Provost stated that he feels positive about the overall process, because we have succeeded in preserving our promise to the students. The instructional responsibilities will essentially remain unchanged. We are preserving the excellence of our programs. We have avoided any reductions in the budget of graduate teaching assistants. We have minimized the number of staff layoffs, but there have been layoffs already and more are planned. The Provost emphasized that we will be gracious in dealing with the layoff process. Units will use their savings to delay layoffs and in some cases buy time until someone retires or natural turnover occurs. The Provost stated that we are faced with difficult times, but we need to stay together and remain united so that we can continue to move forward and make an even better University.

Chair Miller-Hooks introduced Vice President Wylie.

Summary from Administrative Affairs

Vice President Wylie stated that the eleven units that report to her started preparing for potential cuts in the summer. They were asked not to hire and to restrict discretionary spending wherever possible. When budget cuts came down, they were in the form of base cuts and one-time cuts and were distributed among units proportionally. Vice President Wylie stated that she was aware that it would not be possible to receive the funds back in a proportional way, because some units do not have one-time funds. If they cut their base funds, they would have to stop essential services. Reports were submitted from units in mid-September. She discussed the implications of the decisions with unit heads. Final decisions were made by applying three major principles: protect jobs wherever possible, maintain essential services and protect facilities renewal. A University-wide decision was made not to cut public-safety. The Strategic Plan has particular objectives that fall within Administrative Affairs. Vice President Wylie explained that she internally reallocated cuts abiding by those principles. She discussed all of her decisions with department heads before implementing them. She also emphasized that we are facing difficult times in the coming months. In Administrative Affairs, our ability to protect essential services is severely threatened, but we will do the best we can as we move forward.

Q&A

Senator David Tilley, Faculty, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, asked what steps are we taking to increase revenue?

Provost Farvardin stated that during the process, they discussed approaches to generate new revenue. He gave some examples that the University has recently implemented, including the expansion of summer and winter programs, the expansion of Executive and Professional Masters programs in several colleges, online courses and short courses for government and industry sectors. These are all revenue generating programs. The University has also done very well with its private fund raising efforts despite budget issues. The University's success in research funding has increased 30% in the past year from \$401M to \$580M.

Senator Lisa Crisalli, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, asked whether the University's acquisition of a portion of University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute (UMBI) plays a role in the decision to combine the College of Life Sciences (CLFS) and the College of Computers, Mathematical & Physical Sciences (CMPS).

Provost Farvardin stated that UMBI is 1 of the 13 system schools. The Board of Regents decided to disaggregate UMBI and pieces will go to the remaining institutions. He stated that the two issues are unrelated. The possible merger of the two colleges is at a preliminary level and is not a done deal. The UMBI deal is done and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will be completed at the end of December.

Senator Michael Scholten, Graduate Student, College of Computers, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, asked what the University has done to talk to the State to raise undergraduate tuition in order to raise revenue and whether the Senate can do anything to help these efforts.

Provost Farvardin clarified that out-of-state tuition has been raised, but in-state tuition has been frozen for the past four years. He also stated that the issue is political and that the University does not have much of a say. You could argue both sides of the issue: tuition has been frozen for four years, and it is about time to raise it; or that it is a difficult economic time for families, so raising tuition would lead to our students' inability to complete their education. His personal opinion is that we are in a place to raise in-state tuition modestly and use a portion of the revenue generated toward need-based scholarships.

Vice President Wylie stated that while in-state tuition was held constant, the State replaced the funds in our budget. However, they have since taken those funds away. The only way that we can get a tuition increase is if the students make a statement that they care about quality.

Senator Julia Burke, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, introduced Steven Swann, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences. Swann stated that the Provost mentioned the priority given to protecting programs that are "excellent, high-quality and important to the visibility of the University." To what extent does this paradigm include programs that fit these criteria and yet do not produce high yields of revenue or graduates, at least partially, as a result of current resource deprivation?

Provost Farvardin stated that we are under pressure by the Regents to justify our low degree productivity programs. A lot will depend on the magnitude of future cuts. At this point, we do not need to cut any additional programs given the budget cuts thus far. If we reach a point when we are forced to eliminate programs, low-degree programs will be looked at more seriously, but it will not be the only factor. We must look at the entire issue, gather campus input, review priorities of faculty and students

and review market demand in order to make a balanced decision. He stated that he cannot guarantee that low-degree productivity programs will be fully protected.

Swann followed up, asking if the Provost had benchmarks for what a holistic analysis looks like.

Provost Farvardin stated that shared governance would play a role. He said it is difficult to come up with benchmarks, but rather that we will have to use our collective wisdom and be open to suggestions.

Senator Roberto Celi, Faculty, College of Engineering, asked about the role of Congress' stimulus funding on our budget situation.

Vice President Wylie stated that initially there was \$15M identified as stimulus, but there are restrictions on how the State could use those funds. When budget cuts came down, the State replaced the stimulus funds with other funds that could then be cut. The result is that our general fund appropriation no longer includes stimulus funds.

Provost Farvardin stated that the University will probably be the beneficiary of stimulus funds through our external research programs. We are probably starting to see the fruit of that this year, but it does not help our base budget situation.

Senator Arthur Johnson, Faculty, College of Engineering, introduced Dr. Adel Shirmohammadi, Faculty, College of Agriculture & Natural Resources (AGNR). He stated that AGNR was increasing their enrollment of international students and asked whether other colleges could do the same while staying within the allowable ratio of in-state to out-of-state students.

Provost Farvardin stated that the idea is constructive and that the administration started working on the idea last year. The undergraduate international population is about 2%, so making a significant impact on that population will take some time. Their modest efforts last year resulted in approximately a 40% increase. The Provost stated that they will continue to work to increase this population.

Senator Martha Nell Smith, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, stated her concerns for how much the "funding tail" is wagging the "research and intellectual dog". She asked whether decisions have been made about diversity programs.

Provost Farvardin stated that no decisions have been made. He explained that these processes need to take their course and that they start with a discussion. Some discussions will lead to actions, but no final decision will be made without significant community engagement. APAC is only the first stage of the shared governance process which also includes the Senate Programs Curricula and Courses (PCC) Committee, the Graduate Council, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and the Senate. These processes are in place to ensure that decisions will be made only after full consultation.

Senator Martha Nell Smith, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that she hopes he will consult faculty who came to the University because of its commitment to diversity before final decisions are made.

Provost Farvardin stated that he will engage the community as intensely as possible. He stated that the only way to come out of this difficult situation is to engage the community; and if mistakes are made, he will make the commitment to adjust.

Senator Josef Parker, Undergraduate, College of Arts & Humanities, introduced Malcolm Harris. Harris stated that the students are happy to help with the difficult budget decisions. He further stated that students do not have access to specific budget documents in order to give informed input. He asked when those documents will be shared with the entire community.

Provost Farvardin stated that the detailed University budget is available in the library and has been provided to the students who have placed it online. He stated that he does not use the most detailed information, but has provided the budget information that is at his discretion to his student advisory group. He also met with the legislators of the Student Government Association (SGA) and promised to share this information with them as well. The Provost stated that if the students wanted all of the details, they are outlined in the complete budget.

Vice President Wylie stated that the full budget has all of the details from phone costs to salaries. She further stated that if a line is not occupied, the funding for that line is discretionary during that year, but then the budget is reset the following year. This document is what the State uses to give the University our cuts, but it may not be in the form that the students want it.

Harris further asked about outside consultants' descriptions and about how student fees are being used.

Vice President Wylie stated that those costs would be under operating costs for each unit. You would have to ask the units for that information; it is not kept centrally until the end of the year.

Senator Lillian Doherty, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, inquired about the tactic of combining units. She stated that this will decrease the leadership pool at the University, thus, decreasing the diversity of this pool. She hoped that this was a consideration that they looked into when combining units, not just the dollars saved.

Provost Farvardin stated that he would take her concern to heart. How can we cut without hurting some part of the University? Ultimately, we have to return these funds to the State. We have reached a point that any decision will be painful and will have a negative impact on some priority for some unit or some cause for some individual. Ultimately, we have to make a decision among the bad choices.

Senator Robert Hayes, Undergraduate, College of Engineering introduced Sona Java, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences. She asked how real is community engagement if students on APAC cannot vote and if students have no say on who is on APAC?

Provost Farvardin stated that budget reductions decisions are not limited to APAC. They are just the first layer of the shared governance process. No significant decisions with academic implications will be made without going through the complete process. The students have representation and a vote in the other layers of the process.

Java asked why students do not have voting power on APAC and why students cannot vote for who sits on APAC.

Provost Farvardin explained that APAC is advisory without formal voting. He also stated that any administrator has the opportunity to select a group of individuals to advise him or her and that is what APAC is to the Provost.

Senator Zhanqing Li, Faculty, College of Computers, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, was concerned about the policy related to furloughs - that it does not allow faculty to make up salary loss from furloughs from grant funding. University of California faculty are allowed to make up the funding. The University will gain money, because of the overhead return. If we continue to cut faculty salaries, we risk the chance that they will leave and take their funding with them.

Chair Miller-Hooks stated that because of the desire to continue debate, we should consider extending the meeting by 15 minutes. She asked if there were any objections to the extension. Seeing none, the meeting was extended to 5:30 p.m.

Vice President Wylie stated that grants are given for a fixed amount of salary and many people do not have funding to support this transfer. These factors went into the decision to not allow the transfer of funding.

Senator Gloria Coates, Non-Exempt Staff, Payroll Services, asked whether there is a document that identifies all of the possible layoffs.

Vice President Wylie stated that there is no document of who is going to be laid off. The University has only laid off 31 people for budgetary reasons since July 1. We have primarily used unfilled positions to make the cuts.

Provost Farvardin stated that we are making a concerted effort to avoid layoffs by buying time for retirements or turnover. Units may not know at this point whether they absolutely have to perform layoffs.

Senator Jonathan Dinman, Faculty, College of Life Sciences, asked why we are not trying to allow faculty to transfer funds from grants to make up for furloughs. He has serious concerns about retention of productive faculty.

Vice President Wylie stated that we have a universal requirement across campus that 75% of salary must come from state funds.

Drew Baden, Chair, Physics Department, clarified that furloughs can be replaced with grant funding, but a salary reduction cannot. Since our furloughs were put in as an overall temporary salary reduction we cannot make the transfer.

Senator Kevin Tervalta, Undergraduate, College of Arts & Humanities, introduced Vicky Foxworth. She stated that there is a distinct feeling that there is not an inclusive process. She feels that trust is eroding not because of budget cuts but processes. She urged the Provost to open up, because people do not feel that there is a loop to be kept in. She urged him to expand his circle of advisors for a more inclusive process. We need a broader viewpoint that is not just about data and numbers.

Provost Farvardin respectfully disagreed with her assessment, but also stated that he is open to suggestions. He stated that this is a large community and it is humanly impossible to include everyone, but he is open to constructive suggestions.

Dean James Harris, College of Arts & Humanities (ARHU), stated that rumor is difficult but discussing everything in front of everyone is very difficult. He stated that ARHU has a process. He has discussed each move with every unit and the entire faculty. No decisions have been made. He clarified that the combining of units is not just to cut money. We are doing this to create more strength, not less strength. This came from a separate diversity committee with a lot of input. This is not a simple situation. Everyone thinks someone else will be cut.

Senator Emily Burke, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, introduced Arthur Eckstein. He stated that he thought that the last thing that should be cut is the Associate Provost for Equity & Diversity. He is also concerned about Classics being destroyed, because our peer institutions all have an independent Classics department.

Provost Farvardin stated that the idea of merging Classics into another unit is not a rumor. No decision has been made. This proposal will go through the processes and everyone will learn way in advance, before things get serious. Something must be cut in order to make up for the shortfall. The Provost also stated that Dr. Black has been essential and invaluable to the University's diversity efforts. The decision to restructure does not diminish his contributions. The decision was a direct consequence of the budget issues. There are three major units that report to him: the Nyumburu Center, the Office of Multi-Ethnic Student Education (OMSE) and the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) Office. He decided to fully protect the personnel and services of those three offices. As a result, he decided to temporarily reorganize the functions of the position to a part-time position until we have more budget flexibility. He added that false rumors and statements have been spread, including that these three offices will be dismantled. He clearly stated that

his decision was made in order to fully protect these three offices. The University's commitment to diversity is deep and unwavering. The Strategic Plan of the University reads, "Build an inclusive community that celebrates differences, brings people from the widest array of backgrounds and perspectives and recognizes that excellence cannot be achieved without diversity." He stated that even in these difficult budget times, we continue to have a number of major activities that are focused on promoting and strengthening diversity. These include: a major renovation of the OMSE offices, expansion of tutoring programs within OMSE, a new program for closing the achievement gap, a new minor for Latina/Latino studies and hard budget funding for a second staff member in the LGBT Office. Since becoming Provost, we have hired seven new deans, one is African American, another is Asian and two are women. The leadership team is becoming more diverse. We are also developing a new program focused on recruiting minority students, because the number of African American freshmen students dropped significantly this year. We are in the midst of developing a University Diversity Plan. He assured the Senate that diversity plans will only get stronger. He stated that it is wrong to link one administrative decision, prompted by our budgetary situation, to a lack of commitment to diversity.

Senator Robert Hayes, Undergraduate, College of Engineering, made a motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes. The motion was seconded.

Chair Miller-Hooks called for a vote on the motion. The result was a majority against the motion. The motion failed, so Chair Miller-Hooks adjourned the meeting.

New Business

There was no time for new business.

Adjournment

Senate Chair Miller-Hooks adjourned the meeting at 5:32 p.m.



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	09-10-20
PCC ID #:	n/a
Title:	Slate of Nominees for the Senate Nominations Committee
Presenter:	Linda Mabbs, Chair of the 2009-2010 Committee on Committees
Date of SEC Review:	November 17, 2009
Date of Senate Review:	December 10, 2009
Voting (highlight one):	<p>1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or</p> <p>2. In a single vote</p> <p>3. To endorse entire report</p>
Statement of Issue:	
Presentation of the 2009-2010 Senate Nominations Committee nominees, as assembled by the Senate Committee on Committees, to be approved by the Senate Executive Committee and the University Senate.	
Relevant Policy # & URL:	n/a
Recommendation:	To approve the slate as presented.
Committee Work:	<p>The Committee on Committees met on October 28, 2009, to discuss a process for collecting nominations for the Senate Nominations Committee. The Senate Office had previously emailed the Outgoing Senators regarding the opportunity to serve on the Nominations Committee. As required by the Senate Bylaws, the Committee on Committees assembled at least 8 nominees from among the Outgoing Senators to present to the Senate.</p> <p>The Committee on Committees solicited nominations to fill the following minimum requirements for membership on the Nominations Committee: 4 faculty members, 1 exempt staff member, 1 nonexempt staff member, 1 graduate student, and 1 undergraduate student.</p> <p>The Committee on Committees voted via email to approve the attached slate on November 10, 2009.</p>

Alternatives:	To not approve the slate or to hold an election following any additional nominations received from the floor of the Senate.
Risks:	There are no related risks.
Financial Implications:	There are no financial implications.
Further Approvals Required:	Presidential Approval

2009-2010 Senate Nominations Committee Slate

<u>Name</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>College</u>	<u>Term</u>
Faculty			
Beth Alvarez	Libraries	LIBR	2010
Ellen Fabian	Counseling and Personnel Services	EDUC	2010
Frank Siewerdt	Animal and Avian Sciences	AGNR	2010
Sally Simpson	Criminology and Criminal Justice	BSOS	2010
Exempt Staff			
Becky Zonies Kenemuth	College Park Scholars Life Sciences	CLFS	2010
Non-Exempt Staff			
Warren Pointer	Smith IT	BMGT	2010
Graduate Student			
Aaron Tobiason	Theatre	ARHU	2010
Undergraduate Student			
Elizabeth Bollinger	Letters and Sciences	UGST	2010



**University Senate
TRANSMITTAL FORM**

Senate Document #:	09-10-21
PCC ID #:	N/A
Title:	Proposed Policy and Procedures for Part-Time Status of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Due to Childrearing Responsibilities
Presenter:	Eric Kasischke, Chair
Date of SEC Review:	11/17/2009
Date of Senate Review:	12/10/2009
Voting (highlight one):	<p>1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report</p>
Statement of Issue:	
<p>This proposed policy reflects a growing trend in higher education to offer family friendly policies as a means of attracting and retaining highly talented faculty members (University of Michigan Center for the Education of Women, 2008). Recent studies reveal that many of the best and brightest women from top-ranked doctoral programs are not applying for academic positions in research universities because they do not believe they can balance the demands of work and family life (Mason, Goulden & Frasch, 2009). The intent of this proposal is to add temporary part-time appointments to the tool kit of formal work arrangements that are available to faculty at the University of Maryland.</p> <p>The University System of Maryland currently permits reduced (part-time) appointments and provides some general guidance for implementation of part-time tenure track and tenured appointments. The System policy stipulates that, "Each institution which employs part-time tenure-track and/or part-time tenured faculty shall develop written procedures for the appointment, promotion, and granting of tenure to such faculty" (USM II-1.10 UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND PROCEDURES FOR PARTTIME TENURE-TRACK AND PART-TIME TENURED FACULTY). The University of Maryland has not developed its own procedures. Presently part-time arrangements at the university are handled by partial leaves without pay under a wide variety of arrangements and for a wide variety of reasons. Requests for part-time appointments are negotiated on a case-by-case basis without</p>	

	guidelines for decisions about the legitimacy of the requests.
Relevant Policy # & URL:	N/A
Recommendation:	The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends the implementation of a new Policy and Procedures for Part-Time Status of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Due to Childrearing Responsibilities.
Committee Work:	On 5/12/2009 the Faculty Affairs Committee voted unanimously to approve a policy that provides procedures allowing tenure and tenure track faculty to temporarily reduce their appointments to part-time status.
Alternatives:	To reject procedures and a policy allowing tenure and tenure-track faculty to temporarily reduce their appointments to part-time status.
Risks:	There is a risk of not remaining competitive with our peer institutions.
Financial Implications:	There are no financial implications.
Further Approvals Required: <i>(*Important for PCC Items)</i>	Senate, Presidential

Approved by Faculty Affairs Committee-9/23/09
Amended 10/21/09

**Proposed Policy and Procedures for Part-Time Status of Tenured and
Tenure-Track Faculty Due to Childrearing Responsibilities**

Background on Family-Friendly Policies

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

Studies using data from the national Survey of Doctorate Recipients (NSF 1995, 1999) further reveal that for women with Ph.D.s, the combination of marriage and childrearing dramatically decreases women’s likelihood of entering a tenure-track position (Goulden, Mason & Wolfinger, 2005). Moreover, for faculty in tenure track positions, men were 20% more likely to achieve tenure than women. Women who had babies early in their academic careers were less likely to obtain tenure than those who delayed childrearing. However, postponing pregnancy and childbirth until the receipt of tenure is biologically problematic for many women and is likely to become even more so in the future. The average age of obtaining tenure in the sciences and social sciences has increased from 36 in 1985 to more than 39 in 1999. The average age of a Ph.D. recipient has likewise increased from 31 to 33 in the last two decades. In many of the sciences, Ph.D. graduates typically complete 2-5 year post-doctoral appointments before accepting academic positions at research universities, further delaying entrance to the tenure track. Thus, the challenges of timing faculty careers and family formation are likely to intensify for future generations of Ph.D. students.

In response to this research, institutions such as the University of California, Berkeley and the University of Michigan have taken leadership roles in establishing family accommodation policies for childbearing and childrearing, declaring them to be “fundamental to an equitable and productive academic environment” (UC Berkeley, APM-760-0). The intent of these policies is to provide a range of options for faculty with families. Initial policies to address this issue were aimed at delaying the tenure clock. Analyses of tenure delay requests revealed that both women and men took advantage of such policies, but women were more reluctant than men to request a delay out of

fear that colleagues and administrators would not consider them to be serious about their careers. Consequently, these policies were refined so that faculty members would not have to request the delay but would receive automatic entitlement to a delay in the tenure clock for childbearing and adoption. Policies further mandated that internal and external reviewers for tenure evaluate the totality of a faculty member's accomplishment, not the rate of accomplishment (e.g., UC Berkeley, APM 220 Appendix B). Following the lead of other research institutions, the University of Maryland adopted a policy in 2006 that allows for automatic delay of the tenure clock for the birth or adoption of a child.

Reduction of Faculty Appointments

While tenure delay policies relieve some pressures on junior faculty members engaged in significant family caregiving, they do not provide help in balancing professional careers and childrearing responsibilities. Consequently, universities have begun to institute a range of policies that provide flexible work arrangements, such as paid dependent care leaves, leaves in excess of the mandated Family Medical Leave, and modified duties and reduced appointments, to accommodate child-bearing and care of young children (Center for Education of Women, 2007). Women currently comprise more than half of all U.S. Ph.D.s and underrepresented minorities are an increasing percentage of all doctorates. Surveys indicate that both of these groups have a strong interest in family accommodations (Cockrell, 2006). Increasing numbers of male faculty members are involved in rearing young children and have also shown an interest in family accommodations.

The intent of this proposal is to add temporary part-time appointments to the tool kit of formal work arrangements that are available to faculty at the University of Maryland.¹ According to the Center for Education of Women (2007), family friendly policies such as temporary part-time appointments, are most prevalent at doctoral extensive institutions and these institutions also offer the greatest range of arrangements. Of those research universities that offer part-time appointments to tenure track/tenured faculty, 97% allow academic departments to retain the faculty member's budget line for when the faculty member returns to full-time status. Research universities that have adopted flexible work arrangements are positioning themselves to keep talented faculty, and particularly women, in the academic pipeline. These institutions also claim to be preparing themselves for a future hiring boom, as large numbers of faculty plan to retire during the next decade.

The University System of Maryland currently permits reduced (part-time) appointments and provides some general guidance for implementation of part-time tenure track and tenured appointments. The System policy stipulates that, "Each institution which employs part-time tenure-track and/or part-time tenured faculty shall develop written procedures for the appointment, promotion, and granting of tenure to such faculty" (USM II-1.10 UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND PROCEDURES FOR PARTTIME TENURE-TRACK AND PART-TIME TENURED FACULTY). The University of Maryland has not developed its own procedures. Presently part-time arrangements at the university are handled by partial leaves without pay under a wide variety of arrangements and for a wide variety of reasons. Requests for part-time appointments are negotiated on a case-by-case basis without guidelines for decisions about the legitimacy of the requests.

¹ This policy does not preclude adopting other arrangements, such as Family Leave, instead of or in addition to partial appointments, as appropriate.

The proposed policy builds on the current USM policy but tailors it to the specific needs of the University of Maryland and to a specific set of issues, the care of young children. The new policy:

- Facilitates and legitimizes the use of part-time appointments for tenured/tenure track faculty members who wish to reduce their obligations for a limited time period because of the birth/adoption of a child or need to care for young children,
- Provides a set of uniform guidelines for negotiating and implementing these part-time arrangements, and
- Specifies how contractual and tenure/promotion reviews will be handled for faculty on limited term, part-time appointments.

Proposed Policy and Procedures

II-1.10(A) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR PART-TIME STATUS OF TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY DUE TO CHILDREARING RESPONSIBILITIES

(Approved by the President _____)

1. Units may employ tenured or tenure-track faculty members on a part-time appointment on a temporary basis. A part-time appointment shall be a minimum of a fifty percent (50%) appointment. Part-time appointments shall be approved for a minimum period of a full academic semester (e.g., fall semester, spring semester) up to a maximum of two years. These appointments may be renewed for tenured faculty (in maximum blocks of two years). For faculty on an academic year contract, the starting date of the appointment must coincide with the start date of an academic semester and the end date must coincide with the end of an academic semester. For faculty on a fiscal year contract, the starting date must correspond to the beginning (7/1) or the midpoint (1/8) of the year, and must last a minimum period of a full academic semester and maximum of two years.
2. Eligibility. This policy applies only to tenured or tenure-track faculty who request a temporary reduction to part-time status in order to prepare for a newborn child and/or to care for a child under the age of five years, including children placed in the home as a result of adoption or foster care. This policy shall be extended to the children of domestic partners at such time as the Board of Regents recognizes domestic partners as immediate family members. Faculty making the request must attest that they are responsible for 50% or more of the care of a child.
3. Length of appointment reduction.
 - (a) Tenure-track faculty. The length of a tenure-track faculty member's initial contract and probationary period for tenure consideration is based upon the number of full-time equivalent years accrued by the faculty member at the institution in a tenure-track rank. For tenure-track faculty, part-time status may be granted for a maximum period of two full academic year or fiscal year appointments during the pre-tenure probationary period. These partial appointments result in a one year maximum delay in the tenure clock regardless of the year in which they were initiated and the decision about how the reduction is allocated (e.g. two separated one-year-reductions). If the first of the fractional appointments begins during the initial three-year contract period, the contract review is delayed a year and the

faculty member should receive a one-year contract extension of the initial contract. If the first partial appointment begins after the initial three-year contract review, the faculty member receives contracts covering the subsequent four years and is reviewed for tenure by the end of seventh year.² These periods of reduced appointment may be contiguous or noncontiguous, and they may result from a single event or multiple events. Eligibility for consideration for a part-time appointment shall extend from three months prior to five years following the birth or placement of a child. Faculty eligible for part-time status related to childbearing/ childrearing responsibilities are also entitled to extensions of time for consideration for tenure review under the same terms and conditions as full-time tenure track faculty as set forth in II-1.00(D) University of Maryland Policy on Extension of Time for Tenure Review Due to Personal and Professional Circumstances.³

(b) Tenured faculty. The conditions of eligibility for tenured faculty are the same as for tenure-track faculty. Temporary reductions from a full-time appointment shall be for a minimum period of an academic semester and a maximum period of two years. These part-time appointments are renewable with appropriate approvals. Each renewal may be requested for a period lasting a minimum of a semester to a maximum period of two (2) years. The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) governing these temporary part-time appointments for tenured faculty must specify changes in obligations and the conditions under which the appointee may return to a full-time position or request a renewal of the temporary part-time appointment at the same or a different percentage for another period of a minimum of one academic semester and maximum of two (2) years.

4. Procedures. Any faculty member who meets the eligibility requirements for this policy may request a temporary reduction of duties. Under ordinary circumstances, this request will be granted. The faculty member shall make a formal written request to the department chair or unit head, stating the basis of his/her need for a temporary part-time appointment. The notice should include an attestation by the faculty member of eligibility. The faculty member's request must be submitted by the end of the semester before the appointment is slated to begin. The proposed reduction in appointment and duties should then be discussed and negotiated with the chair/unit head to arrive at a mutually acceptable MOU. Then the chair/unit head must prepare (a) a MOU and (b) a letter supporting or opposing the request. The MOU should specify the reason for the request, the length of the part-time status, expectations for faculty duties, and, where applicable, revised schedules for contract, promotion, and other reviews, and provisions for ending the proposed fractional appointment and return to full-time status. The unit head/chair's letter must include a rationale for supporting or opposing the request, and a description of the financial and staffing implications. The formal letter of request, chair's response and MOU must first be forwarded to the Dean (where appropriate) and then to the Provost for approval or denial. Upon approval of the part-time appointment and accompanying arrangements, the

² Thus a faculty member on a 50% appointment for the maximum period of two years would be reviewed in the 7th rather than the 6th year. Partial appointments (regardless of length) under this policy delay the mandatory tenure review by one year and partial appointments which are initiated in the first three years of appointment extend the contract review by a year.

³ A faculty member on a 50% appointment for the maximum period of two years would be reviewed in the 7th year. If the faculty member is also approved for a two year delay in the tenure clock, the review would occur in the 9th year. A faculty member on a 100% appointment with a two year delay in the tenure clock would be reviewed in the 8th year.

MOU shall be co-signed by the faculty member, chair/unit head, Dean, and Provost.

5. Departments/units shall be able to use the unused portion of the salary of a tenure track/tenured faculty member on a temporary part-time appointment due to childrearing responsibilities to fund coverage of the faculty member's teaching, advising, service and related duties.
6. Performance, Tenure, and Promotion Reviews. No person shall be discriminated against in any promotion and tenure proceedings or merit review as a result of seeking or being granted part-time status in accordance with these procedures. Personnel reviews shall be conducted in the same manner as those conducted for full-time faculty. Internal and external reviewers of faculty performance should be apprised that faculty members who have been granted part-time appointments should be judged by the quality and quantity of their accomplishments, but not by the rate of their accomplishments.
7. A faculty member who believes that her or his request for part-time status has been unfairly or improperly denied may bring the matter to the attention of the Faculty Ombuds Officer and seek a review in accordance with the procedures of the University of Maryland Policy governing faculty grievances (University of Maryland Policy II-4.00(A)).

References

- Cockrell, C. (2006, April 13). Family-friendly policies for faculty are now “an entitlement.” *Berkeleyan*, University of California, Berkeley.
- Goulden, M., Mason, M.A., & Wolfinger, N. (2005). Do babies matter: Refining gender equity in the academy. In *Mentoring for Academic Careers in Engineering: Proceedings of the PAESMEM/Stanford School of Engineering Workshop* (pages 89-105). Santa Barbara, CA: Grayphics Publishing.
- Mason, M.A., Goulden, M., & Frasch, K. (2009). Why graduate students reject the fast track. *Academe*, 95(1), 1-8.
- University of Michigan Center for the Education of Women. (2007). *Family friendly policies in higher education: A five-year report*. Ann Arbor: Author. <http://www.cew.umich.edu/PDFs/Redux%20Brief%20Final%205-1.pdf>

Frequently Asked Questions

Proposed Policy and Procedures for Part-Time Status of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Due to Childrearing Responsibilities

1. Is it required that a new parent take part-time status?

No. This is an option that we expect will be infrequently taken, since it involves a commensurate (and significant) reduction in salary. It is an available option that can be used if needed.

2. Must the appointment be reduced to 50%.

No. 50% is the maximum reduction.

3. How does this impact tenure clock delays?

The following table summarizes some of the possible scenarios and delays. *Note that higher percentages of appointment (e.g., 66%) have the same impact on year of review as a 50% appointment because the timing of the review is based on completion of a whole academic year.*

Option for Pre-Tenure Faculty	Tenure Review Year
Regular schedule: no tenure clock delay, no part-time appointment	Year 6
One semester of 50% or more part-time	Year 7
One year of 50% or more part-time	Year 7
Two years of 50% or more part-time	Year 7
One semester of 50% or more part-time, 2 years later another semester	Year 7
One year of tenure clock delay and 1 year of 50% or more part-time	Year 8
Two years of tenure clock delay and 2 years of 50% or more part-time	Year 9

By itself, the partial reduction in appointment permitted in this policy, regardless of the length of the reduction and the fraction of reduction, produces a one- year delay. The university also allows a maximum of two years of delay of the tenure clock. If the two kinds of delay were combined (two years of tenure clock delay and also, two years of part-time appointment) it would result in a maximum of 3 years of delay. The faculty member would come up for tenure in year 9, instead of year 6.

4. Why is there a limit of two full academic years of part-time appointment for pre-tenure faculty?

Because it was felt that the tenure process should not be delayed further than the ninth year.

5. How will expectations for productivity for tenure change if taken a part-time appointment?

Internal and external reviewers of faculty performance should be apprised that faculty members who have been granted part-time appointments should be judged by the *quality and quantity* of their accomplishments, but *not by the rate* of their accomplishments.

6. Are there any limits for post-tenure faculty?

Part-time status after tenure is left to the faculty member and the unit head to negotiate as mutually agreeable. Agreements to reduce an appointment for two-years are renewable.

7. Why is there a requirement for at least a 50% appointment?

Because benefits (retirement, health, etc.) are lost below 50% appointment.

8. Does a 50% appointment mean that you need to work 50% every day?

No. The exact arrangements are to be negotiated between the person taking the part-time appointment and the unit head, and can be worked out as mutually agreeable.

9. Does this policy place an upper limit on what can be taken or offered?

No. Unit heads and faculty are free to arrange additional, or entirely different, accommodations. For example, the unit head may offer modified teaching duties instead, or in addition to, tenure clock delays or part-time status.

10. What if faculty members are pressured into accepting a part-time appointment they don't want to take to save the department money?

Any inappropriate action by the unit head, including this one, should be reported to the Faculty Ombuds Officer.

11. Can the unit head deny the request?

Yes, but only under unusual circumstances. The denial must be approved by the Dean (where appropriate) and the Provost.

There is no financial incentive for the unit head to deny the request, since the salary that is saved can be used to pay for covering the faculty member's teaching, advising, etc.