



## CALL TO ORDER

---

Senate Chair Laura Dugan called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m.

Dugan stated that the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) had set the agenda with two Special Order presentations at the end of the meeting in order to ensure that the action items on the agenda could be completed, while allotting the remainder of the time to the presentations. She asked if there were any objections to the order of the agenda; hearing none, she proceeded with the meeting.

Dugan provided a brief reminder on voting procedures on the TurningPoint platform and stated that Senators who wish to make a motion that is in order when someone else has the floor can use the coffee mug feature in Zoom, which can be found in the participants window.

## APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 8, 2020 SENATE MINUTES

---

Chair Dugan asked if there were any corrections to the minutes as distributed.

Senator Sakurai, exempt staff, made a motion to postpone the correction and approval of the minutes until the December Senate meeting. The motion was seconded.

Dugan opened the floor to discussion of the motion.

Senator Sakurai stated that the purpose of the motion was to have time to bring minute-keeping practices and the Bylaws into alignment, using procedures from *Robert's Rules of Order* as a guideline. They stated that it is important that the Senate's governing documents should be followed as closely as possible because the University's accreditation has already been in jeopardy regarding issues of governance. Senator Sakurai also noted that they were aware that another Senator was planning to propose an amendment to the Bylaws at the November Senate meeting to make it clear that current minute-keeping practices could be allowable, so postponing the approval of the minutes until December would allow for possible Bylaw amendments to be approved before the minutes were approved. Senator Sakurai also stated that they may make more corrections or motions if the Senate were to vote against the motion to postpone the approval of the minutes.

Past Chair Lanford stated that *Robert's Rules* are used by representative bodies to bring order to meetings and allow the group to take care of business in an efficient manner. She clarified that the MiddleStates accreditation issues related to governance involved relationships with outside governing bodies, not Senate processes.

Senator Sakurai stated that the Senate Bylaws allow *Robert's Rules* to be overridden, if the Rules do not work well for the Senate.

Dugan called for a vote on the motion. The result was 42 in favor, 60 opposed, and 12 abstentions. **The motion to postpone the approval of the minutes failed.**

Dugan asked Senators if there were any other concerns about the minutes.

Senator Sakurai made a motion to amend the minutes by adding the following language at the end: **The only official part of these minutes are the actions and decisions taken. In case of a discrepancy between the written minutes and the audio recording, the audio recording overrides the written minutes.**

The motion was seconded.

Dugan stated that Parliamentarian Henry had advised that the amendment was not appropriate because according to *Robert's Rules*, the minutes have to reflect what was discussed at the last meeting and ruled the amendment out of order.

Senator Sakurai made a motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair. The motion was seconded.

Dugan clarified that a vote in favor of the motion would oppose the Chair's ruling that Senator Sakurai's amendment was out of order because *Robert's Rules* state that the minutes may only include what was actually discussed during the meeting, and cannot include additional language on recordings but a vote against the motion would support the Chair's ruling.

Dugan spoke first as rules permit for an appeal of the Chair's ruling. She stated that Senator Sakurai raised this issue prior to the meeting, so she consulted with Parliamentarian Henry, and the Senate Leadership reviewed his advice on *Robert's Rules*, which clearly limits the minutes to what is said at the meeting.

Senator Sakurai requested that the Chair provide the section of *Robert's Rules* with the specific provision. They stated that many parts of *Robert's Rules* allow for inclusion of descriptive information, and that Senate minute keeping procedures are out of compliance with other parts of *Robert's Rules*.

Vice President Hollingsworth raised a Point of Order inquiring if a motion to call the question and approve the minutes would be in order.

Dugan consulted with Parliamentarian Henry. She stated that the question could be called after Senator Sakurai finished their statement.

Senator Sakurai requested clarification on the current place in the appeal process. Dugan stated that the Senate will vote on the appeal, and then vote on the minutes. Senator Sakurai stated that their understanding is that calling the question now would be calling the question on the appeal. Dugan confirmed that they would vote on calling the question and then vote on the appeal.

Hollingsworth clarified that he was trying to call the question on the main motion, and will withdraw the motion if that is not in order.

Dugan, Henry, and Senate Director Montfort entered a Zoom breakout room to discuss Parliamentary procedures. Dugan instructed the Senate to stand at ease.

Dugan, Henry, and Montfort returned to the meeting.

Senator Sakurai inquired where in *Robert's Rules* it states that the minutes can only include the content from the meeting, as there are parts of *Robert's Rules* which state that there are descriptive elements in the minutes, and the proposed endnote is descriptive. The minutes already include a sentence about the verbatim recording being available.

Parliamentarian Henry stated that his interpretation of *Robert's Rules* is that adding something that was not discussed at the meeting is beyond what the minutes call for.

Past Chair Lanford stated that she wished to speak after this particular issue of the minutes has been resolved.

Hollingsworth withdrew his motion as it was ruled that his motion would apply only to the appeal of the Chair's motion.

Senators stated that *Robert's Rules* is being interpreted in two different ways, stated that more information on *Robert's Rules* is needed to have an informed discussion, and suggested this topic be introduced as an agenda item in the next meeting.

Dugan stated that she will recognize the two remaining Senators before proceeding to a vote.

Senator Callaghan, faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, requested that the discussion be tabled until the November meeting as the minute-keeping procedures have been long-standing.

Senator Rozenblit, faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, requested clarification on the motion to vote on the appeal.

Dugan explained that Senator Sakurai made a motion to amend the minutes to add a disclaimer explaining that if there is a discrepancy between the minutes and the recording, the recording will supersede the minutes as the official record but she ruled the amendment to be out of order. She stated that the Senator is appealing the Chair's ruling and the Senate is voting on that appeal.

Dugan called for a vote on the motion to appeal the Chair's ruling that the amendment was out of order.

Senator Sakurai made a motion to suspend the rules to dispense with the reading of the minutes and ask for unanimous consent. Dugan and Montfort requested clarification of the motion. Senator Sakurai stated that dispensing with the reading of the minutes will allow the Senate to move onto other agenda items.

Dugan ruled that the motion was out of order because voting on the motion to appeal the Chair's ruling had already begun.

Senator Sakurai raised a Point of Order that they were not given the right to obtain the floor a second time.

Dugan noted that she had stated that the remaining Senators whose hands were raised would be given an opportunity to speak before proceeding to a vote, and noted that Senator Sakurai's hand was not raised. She also stated that Senator Sakurai was given multiple opportunities to speak, but the vote on the motion to appeal was now open so additional motions were not in order at this time.

Senator Sakurai requested clarification on this ruling and made a motion to appeal this decision of the Chair.

Dugan ruled the motion dilatory and out of order.

The result of the vote on the motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair regarding Senator Sakurai's amendment to the Bylaws being out of order was 17 in favor, 84 opposed, and 14 abstentions. **The motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair failed.**

Dugan called for approval of the minutes and opened the floor for further discussion.

Past Chair Lanford stated that the Chair has a right not to recognize a speaker for dilatory motions, and requested that the Senate support the approval of the minutes.

Senator Iliadis seconded the motion to approve the minutes.

Senator Sakurai made a Point of Order as they did not think it was in order to make comments that did not pertain to correcting or approving the minutes.

Dugan called for a vote to approve the minutes as distributed.

Senator Sakurai requested a ruling on the Point of Order about the decorum issue.

Chair-Elect Williams expressed concern over the disruption of the meeting and supported the Past Chair's comments on the inappropriateness of dilatory behavior.

Senator Sakurai raised an objection to the minutes. They made a motion to correct the minutes as follows:

Senator Sakurai raised a **Point-of-Order Parliamentary Inquiry** that the minutes did not align with the provisions in the Senate Bylaws, which state, "The minutes shall include only actions and business transacted."

Senator Sakurai raised a **Point-of-Order Point of Information** regarding the order of agenda items and specifically inquired as to why the committee report was being presented before the special order item.

The motion was seconded. Dugan asked if there were any objections to approving the minutes as corrected; seeing none, **the minutes were approved as corrected.**

## REPORT OF THE CHAIR

---

Zoom Login Procedures: Chair Dugan noted that based on guidance from the Division of Information Technology (DIT) to prevent Zoombombing, anyone planning to attend a virtual Senate meeting must sign in at [umd.zoom.us](https://umd.zoom.us) before clicking on the meeting link.

Senate Orientation: Dugan stated that Director Montfort had created a Senate Orientation presentation this year in lieu of her annual presentation at the September Senate meeting in order to allow more time for the President's *State of the Campus* address and business at Senate meetings. She encouraged Senators to view the presentation at <https://go.umd.edu/senate-orientation>.

Nominations Committee: Dugan stated that outgoing Senators should have received an email about volunteering for the Nominations Committee. The Committee solicits nominations for the Chair-Elect and membership on the Senate Executive Committee, Committee on Committees, and other University-wide committees and councils. The Nominations committee will meet between January and April. Senators who are interested in serving can submit their application by October 16, 2020, and the Senate will vote on the membership in December.

## TECHNICAL REVISIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY AND PROCEDURES (SENATE DOCUMENT #20-21-05) (INFORMATION)

---

Chair Dugan stated that this item is a technical amendment. She noted that revisions to the University of Maryland Non-Discrimination Policy and Procedures were made to update any references to the recently renamed interim University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on Sexual Harassment and Other Sexual Misconduct.

Dugan noted that the technical amendment has already been reviewed by the Senate leadership and approved by the President and does not require any further action but is provided as an information item for the Senate.

## REVIEW OF THE UMCP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES CONCERNING TELEPHONE SYSTEM USAGE (SENATE DOCUMENT #19-20-51) (ACTION)

---

Jeffrey Klauda, member of the Information Technology (IT) Council, presented the council's recommendations and provided background information.

Dugan thanked Klauda and opened the floor to discussion.

Senator Katz, graduate student, requested assurance that there will not be arbitrary changes to the telephone policy in the future justified as security concerns.

Klauda referred the question to Hollingsworth. Hollingsworth responded that there are guidelines consistent with the Policy on Acceptable Use of Information Technology Resources that authorize the creation of security standards by the Division of Information Technology (DIT) and the Chief Information Officer (CIO). The Board of Regents (BOR) has delegated authority to the CIOs of all campuses to create security standards as necessary, and the standards are consistent with the Policy on campus.

Hearing no further discussion, Dugan called for a vote on the revisions to the policy. The result was 103 in favor, 4 opposed, and 7 abstentions. **The proposal passed.**

## **REVISIONS TO THE COLLEGE OF INFORMATION STUDIES (INFO) PLAN OF ORGANIZATION (SENATE DOCUMENT #12-13-37) (ACTION)**

---

Marcia Shofner, Chair of the Elections, Representation, and Governance (ERG) Committee, presented the revised Plan and provided background information.

Dugan thanked Shofner and opened the floor to discussion; hearing none, she called for a vote on the revised Plan. The result was 115 in favor, 2 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The proposal passed.**

## **SPECIAL ORDER**

---

### **Jack Blanchard**

#### **Associate Provost of Enterprise Resource Planning**

#### ***The Elevate Project: Next Generation Administrative Computing at UMD***

Chair Dugan introduced Jack Blanchard, Associate Provost of Enterprise Resource Planning, and invited him to provide his presentation.

Blanchard provided an overview of the Elevate Project, which seeks to modernize the campus computing systems. The Project will centralize functions of the University's obsolete Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) mainframe computing systems into a single cloud-based system. The University's current systems are not interconnected, and a failure of the Student Information System (SIS) would prevent the University from conducting basic functions.

- The Elevate Project will provide a positive user experience; make the University more efficient; allow for accurate collection, analysis, and reporting of data; ensure data security and privacy; and ensure system reliability.
- The University will partner with Huron and Workday on implementation.
- The project will be proposed to the Board of Regents (BOR) in November 2020, and if approved, to the Department of Public Works in December 2020.
- The start date will be January 2021 and the system will go live in fall 2026.
- The project will cost approximately \$145 million over six years and will be funded by internal sources through FY 2021.
- Funding details are being determined but will involve the University, the University System of Maryland (USM) and other related entities using the ERP, and a student fee starting in FY 2024 that will need to be discussed and approved.

Dugan thanked Blanchard and opened the floor to questions and comments.

Senators expressed concern over the use of student fees to fund this project, stating that the financial burden on students is an equity concern, which would particularly impact graduate

students on a fixed income, and fee-paying students may not benefit from the project as it will take years to implement.

Senators also expressed concerns about the corporatization of the University, and requested information about integrations between current software programs.

Senators questioned the University's commitment to spending a large sum during a budget crisis, requested information on the cost-per-student comparison with other Universities, and inquired if the Elevate Project had been raised with the state legislature.

Blanchard responded that it is necessary to implement the project as the current systems are at risk of failure and have no backup. He shared that the new program has been adapted to higher education and is in use by 27 R1 Institutions, and will be integrated with existing software. Contracts for this project will need to be approved by the BOR and the Department of Public Works.

## **SPECIAL ORDER**

---

**Lisa Taneyhill**

**Chair of the Research Council**

***Update on the Development of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes***

Dugan introduced Lisa Taneyhill, Chair of the Research Council, and invited her to provide her presentation.

Taneyhill shared that the Research Council has been working on reviewing and revising the University Centers and Institutes Policy for the past year, and is in the final stages of considering policy revisions. The Council seeks to solicit additional input based on the feedback received after preliminary revisions were presented to the Senate last year.

Taneyhill summarized the committee's work to date and reviewed the guiding principles:

- A central database is needed.
- Current levels of group, center, and institute should be retained.
- A common proposal with key elements to create new centers or institutes is needed. Proposals and reviews should consider the University's research, teaching, and service mission.
- The initial review of a center or institute should be considered a milestone, and review processes should be specified and vary based on the type of level of center or institute.
- Sunset provisions should be specified after a negative review rather than required to be built in from the outset, and termination procedures may be initiated as a result of a negative review or outside of a review.

In response to feedback, the Research Council has incorporated a director review process in consultation with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs which mirrors the review of department chairs, and made organizational and stylistic changes to the Policy.

Taneyhill requested feedback on the Director Review process for Centers and Institutes, which is the most substantive change made since the last presentation to the Senate. The Research Council plans to present the final Policy at the December Senate meeting.

Dugan thanked Taneyhill and opened the floor to questions and comments.

Senators suggested that Directors should not be reviewed at the same time that centers and institutes are being reviewed; variations in the review process based on the size of the center or institute and amount and sources of funding should be considered; the review period should be aligned with the seven-year timeframe for the review of academic units; and the similarities and differences in the review process in comparison to academic departments should be clarified.

A Senator asked for clarification that existing centers which might not meet standards proposed will be grandfathered in or reclassified at re-review.

Taneyhill stated that all current centers will be put on a review cycle if they are not already on a cycle, and those items would be addressed during the review.

Dugan encouraged Senators to provide additional feedback by using the web form.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

---

There was no New Business.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

---

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.