



## **CALL TO ORDER**

---

Senate Chair Williams called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.

Chair Williams noted that the Senate had a full agenda of business to complete. She asked if there were any objections to limiting speakers to 2 minutes each on each motion or agenda item without the ability to speak again on an item until all others have had the ability to do so the Senate could complete its business. Williams stated that this would ensure that all those who wish to speak have an opportunity to do so. She noted that if there are no objections, a timer would be displayed on the screen to help speakers manage their time. Hearing no objections, the two-minute timer was put in place for the remainder of the meeting.

Williams provided brief instructions on meeting procedures and using the TurningPoint platform for voting.

## **APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 10, 2021 MINUTES (ACTION)**

---

Chair Williams stated that a revised version of the minutes had been distributed following the submission of corrections to the PACT Presentation by Dean Adriene Lim. Williams asked if there were any additional corrections to the minutes as corrected. Hearing none; the minutes were approved as corrected.

## **REPORT OF THE CHAIR**

---

### Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Update

Chair Williams stated that the SEC had met on November 22, 2021 and approved the agenda for the Senate meeting. She noted that the SEC had considered the Plan of Organization Review Committee (PORC) Slate and an additional proposal.

Chair Williams stated that PORC would be responsible for conducting a review of the University's Plan of Organization for Shared Governance and that they would begin their work in the spring 2022 semester. Williams noted that the additional proposal considered by the SEC was associated with a Review of IT Governance on Campus. Williams stated that since PORC is mandated to review all University councils during the Plan of Organization review, the SEC agreed that it would be most efficient to ask PORC to consider the proposal as an example related to constituency-based feedback. Williams noted that a general element in PORC's charge would ask the body to review all of the councils in the context of incorporating constituency-based feedback into the process of developing administrative policies, standards, or guidelines that do not go through the Senate. The SEC voted to send the proposal to PORC along with its charge, once it is convened.

### Additional Senate Meeting

Chair Williams stated that, following discussions of the Senate Leadership with President Pines, and Provost Rice, the Senate Executive Committee had approved the scheduling of a Special Senate Meeting in January 2022 before the start of the spring 2022 semester. Williams noted that the meeting would be held virtually through Zoom on Friday, January 21, 2022, from 2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.

She stated that the meeting would be entirely focused on the Provost's presentation of the draft Strategic Plan and feedback from the Senate on the draft Plan.

Chair Williams encouraged Senator attendance at and participation during the Special Senate Meeting and during the remaining meetings scheduled throughout spring 2022. Williams noted the importance of strong attendance during future meetings, stating that many committees would be making recommendations that would be brought to the Senate for a vote during spring 2022.

#### Procedures

Chair Williams provided an overview of Senate meeting procedures related to participation, providing information for the record, audio recording, introduction of non-Senators, and the 2-minute speaker limit.

### **NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE SLATE 2021-2022 (SENATE DOCUMENT #21-22-26) (ACTION)**

---

Senate Chair Williams invited Rochelle Newman, Chair-Elect and Chair of the Committee on Committees, to present the Nominations Committee Slate.

Newman presented the slate and provided background information.

Chair Williams opened the floor to discussion of the slate.

Senators did not discuss the slate but voted to approve the slate with **111 in favor, 2 opposed, and 10 abstentions. The motion to approve the slate passed.**

### **2021 PLAN OF ORGANIZATION REVIEW COMMITTEE SLATE (SENATE DOCUMENT #21-22-27) (ACTION)**

---

Senate Chair Williams invited Rochelle Newman, Chair-Elect and Chair of the Committee on Committees, to present the Plan of Organization Review Committee Slate.

Newman presented the slate and provided background information.

Chair Williams opened the floor to discussion of the slate.

Senators did not discuss the slate but voted to approve the slate with **121 in favor, 2 opposed, and 10 abstentions. The motion to approve the slate passed.**

### **PCC PROPOSAL TO RENAME THE MASTERS OF ARTS IN "WOMEN'S STUDIES" TO "WOMEN, GENDER, AND SEXUALITY STUDIES" (SENATE DOCUMENT #21-22-23) (ACTION)**

---

Senate Chair Williams invited Valerie Orlando, Chair of the Programs, Curricula, and Courses (PCC) Committee, to present the Proposals to Rename the Master of Arts in "Women's Studies" to "Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies" (Senate Document #21-22-23), the PCC Proposal to Rename Ph.D. in "Women's Studies" to "Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies" (Senate Document #21-22-24), and the PCC Proposal to Rename the Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in "Women's Studies" to "Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies" (Senate Document #21-22-25). Chair Williams stated that the proposals would be presented and discussed together before being voted on separately.

Orlando presented the proposals and provided background information.

Chair Williams opened the floor for discussion of the proposals, noting the two minute speaker time limit; hearing none, she called for a vote on the PCC Proposal to Rename the Master of Arts in “Women’s Studies” to “Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies) (Senate Document #21-22-23). The result was 114 in favor, 2 opposed, and 8 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

### **PCC PROPOSAL TO RENAME PH.D. IN “WOMEN’S STUDIES” TO “WOMEN, GENDER, AND SEXUALITY STUDIES” (SENATE DOCUMENT #21-22-24) (ACTION)**

---

Chair Williams called for a vote on the PCC Proposal to Rename the Ph.D. in “Women’s Studies” to “Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies” (Senate Document #21-22-24). The result was 122 in favor, 3 opposed, and 8 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

### **PROPOSAL TO RENAME THE POST-BACCALAUREATE CERTIFICATE IN “WOMEN’S STUDIES” TO “WOMEN, GENDER, AND SEXUALITY STUDIES” (SENATE DOCUMENT #21-22-25) (ACTION)**

---

Chair Williams called for a vote on the PCC Proposal to Rename the Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in “Women’s Studies” to “Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies” (Senate Document #21-22-25). The result was 121 in favor, 2 opposed, and 7 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

### **PROPOSAL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A UNIVERSITY PRIVACY POLICY (SENATE DOCUMENT #20-21-15) (ACTION)**

---

Chair Williams invited Derek Richardson, Chair of the Information Technology (IT) Council to present the proposal.

Richardson presented the proposal on behalf of the IT Council and provided background information.

Chair Williams noted that amendments to the policy had been submitted in advance of the meeting, so the Senate would consider those before opening the floor to discussion of the IT Council’s recommendations.

Williams invited Senator Reed, faculty, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (BSOS) to present the first amendment.

Senator Reed made a motion to amend the language in Section VI. in order to clarify the process that potential privacy violations would take to determine responsibility. The language of the amendment is noted in **pink**:

**A. Suspected violations of this Policy will undergo a standard University review in accordance with relevant University policies to determine responsibility.**

**AB. University employees or students who are found responsible for violating this Policy and/or the associated Privacy Standards and Guidelines may be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with relevant University policies. Furthermore, certain violations may result in civil penalties and/or criminal prosecution.**

**BC. Unit Heads who are found responsible for knowingly or intentionally violating this Policy and/or the associated Privacy Standards and Guidelines, where such violations lead to, or are responsible for, a reportable security incident or other penalties imposed by government regulators or agencies, may obligate the responsible unit to cover a portion or all of the University remediation costs and/or externally imposed penalties associated with the violation.**

The motion was seconded.

Chair Williams asked Senator Reed to provide the rationale for the amendment.

Senator Reed stated that the amendment was intended to remove responsibility related to investigation and adjudication of policy violations away from the Division of Information Technology (DIT) and to instead refer the violations to existing University structures.

Chair Williams asked Richardson if he would like to respond to the amendment.

Richardson stated that the IT Council would not be opposed to the amendment because it was in line with the intent of the policy.

Chair Williams opened the floor to discussion of the amendment; hearing none she called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 124 in favor, 1 opposed, and 8 abstentions. **The motion to amend the policy passed.**

Chair Williams invited Chair-Elect, Rochelle Newman, to present the second amendment.

Chair-Elect Newman made a motion to amend the language in Section V. to clarify the role of DIT in the implementation of the policy. The language of the amendment is noted in **pink**:

**A. This Policy, the associated Privacy Standards and Guidelines, and the implementation of those instruments are overseen by the University's Chief Data Privacy Officer ([umd-privacy@umd.edu](mailto:umd-privacy@umd.edu)).**

**B. The Division of Information Technology (DIT) is responsible for supporting Units with the implementation of this Policy by providing effective tools, appropriate resources, and training aimed at minimizing potential costs and workload burdens imposed on Units.**

**BC. Standards and Guidelines**

- 1. This Policy is supplemented by Privacy Standards and Guidelines that are developed in coordination with appropriate stakeholders and the University IT Council and maintained by the Chief Data Privacy Officer. These Standards and Guidelines address the operationalization of the privacy Principles identified in Section IV.A, including but not limited to access to specified data types, vendor engagement, incident response, and the exceptions process.**
- 2. The Vice President for Information Technology & Chief Information Officer (VPIT & CIO) or designee may issue, amend, or rescind such Privacy Standards and Guidelines as required to comply with legal obligations and University policy, or to meet the needs of the University Community.**

## ED. Exceptions

1. Where a legitimate need has been demonstrated, such as a novel use of an existing data set for health and safety purposes, the VPIT & CIO or designee, in X-15.00(A) page 5 consultation with appropriate stakeholders, may grant exceptions to this Policy and its Standards and Guidelines.
2. When considering requests for exceptions, the VPIT & CIO or designee, in consultation with appropriate University stakeholders, will evaluate the documented purpose for the exception and the privacy risks to the individuals affected.
3. Subject to the University's legal obligations or circumstances that necessitate immediate access, the University may provide advance notification to an individual prior to the use of the individual's PII pursuant to an exception request. In certain instances, individuals may be unavailable to receive such advance notification, or such notification may not be reasonably practicable. In such cases use may occur without notification, consistent with applicable law.

The motion was seconded.

Chair Williams asked Chair-Elect Newman to provide the rationale for the amendment.

Newman stated that the amendment was intended to clarify the role of DIT in the implementation of the policy.

Chair Williams asked Richardson if he would like to respond to the amendment.

Richardson stated that while the idea that DIT would provide training tools and support to units to aid in the successful implementation of the policy was aligned with the intent of the policy, the amendment, as written, could lead to a situation in which privacy rights are overwritten for the sake of expediency. He noted that because the amendment, as written, does not account for the balance between respecting the privacy rights of data subjects while considering costs and burdens, the IT Council could not support the amendment.

Chair Williams opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Senator Smith, faculty, School of Public Health asked what the IT Council would need to see to be satisfied with the amendment.

Chair Williams recognized Joseph Gridley, Chief Data Privacy Officer, to respond to the question.

Gridley stated that the addition of language stating that training should be aimed at complying with the principles and expectations of the policy while considering minimizing potential costs would address the concerns expressed by Richardson.

Chair-Elect Newman agreed to revise her amendment to incorporate the language suggested by Gridley as follows in brown:

**B. The Division of Information Technology (DIT) is responsible for supporting Units with the implementation of this Policy by providing effective tools, appropriate resources, and training aimed at in order to meet the guidelines and standards of the Privacy Policy while minimizing potential costs and workload burdens imposed on Units.**

Chair Williams opened the floor to discussion of the amendment to the amendment; hearing none Williams asked if there was any objection to accepting the amendment to the amendment; hearing none she called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 125 in favor, 0 opposed, and 8 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment passed.**

Chair Williams invited Senator Goodman, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences to present the third amendment.

Senator Goodman made a motion to remove language in Section V. that would allow the Vice President for Information Technology & Chief Information Officer (VPIT & CIO) to clarify or issue, amend, or rescind Privacy Standards and Guidelines to meet the needs of the University Community, as follows in pink:

## **B. Standards and Guidelines**

**1. This Policy is supplemented by Privacy Standards and Guidelines that are developed in coordination with appropriate stakeholders and the University IT Council and maintained by the Chief Data Privacy Officer. These Standards and Guidelines address the operationalization of the privacy Principles identified in Section IV.A, including but not limited to access to specified data types, vendor engagement, incident response, and the exceptions process.**

**2. The Vice President for Information Technology & Chief Information Officer (VPIT & CIO) or designee may issue, amend, or rescind such Privacy Standards and Guidelines as required to comply with legal obligations and University policy,** ~~or to meet the needs of the University Community.~~

The motion was seconded.

Chair Williams asked Senator Goodman to provide the rationale for the amendment.

Senator Goodman stated that the intent of the amendment was not to prevent the issuing or amending of Privacy Standards and Guidelines but to require consultation with stakeholders prior to changes to the policy.

Chair Williams asked Richardson if he would like to respond to the amendment.

Richardson stated that the intent of the policy was to allow the unit head most closely involved with the implementation of the policy to initiate the creation or updating of standards that addressed the operational needs of the University. Richardson provided an example of a scenario in which the University would need to set an institution-wide standard that sets the criteria used to anonymize a data set. He noted that this change would be driven by the need to meet the needs of the University Community and that the removal of the language proposed in the amendment would remove the ability to issue such a standard. Richardson stated that for that reason, the IT Council could not support the amendment.

Chair Williams opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Chair Williams recognized Joseph Gridley, Chief Data Privacy Officer.

Gridley stated that once the VPIT & CIO identify a change that needs to be made to the policy, the change would still need to be coordinated and approved through the IT Council and other stakeholders, as stated in Section 1 of the Standards and Guidelines.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Williams called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 82 in favor, 24 opposed, and 21 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment passed.**

Chair Williams invited Senator Huard, faculty, CMNS, to present the fourth amendment.

Senator Huard made a motion to amend the language in Section II to clarify the term “full name.” The language of the amendment is noted in **pink**:

**A. “Personally Identifiable Information” means information that is created, received, processed, stored, or transmitted by or on behalf of the University that, alone or in combination with other information, enables the identification of an individual. PII includes but is not limited to a person’s:**

- 1. Full name, including legal name or preferred name;**
- 2. Social Security Number;**
- 3. Driver’s License or other State Identification Number;**
- 4. Passport Number;**
- 5. Biometric information including physiological, biological, or behavioral characteristics, including an individual’s DNA, that can be used alone or in combination with other identifying data to establish an individual’s identity;**
- 6. Geolocation Data;**
- 7. Internet or network activity, including browsing history, search history, and information regarding an identifiable individual’s interaction with an internet website, application, or advertisement;**
- 8. Financial account number, credit card number, or debit card number that, in combination with any required security code, access code, or password, would permit access to an individual’s account; and**
- 9. Identifiable health information, including disability status, related to the past, present, or future physical or mental health or condition of an individual.**

The motion was seconded.

Chair Williams asked Senator Huard to provide the rationale for the amendment.

Senator Huard stated that although the term “full name” comes from privacy law, the University uses the terms “legal name” and “preferred name” as well. Huard noted that the change would support recent Senate work on preferred names and gender markers, and would also align with the equity principle of the Privacy Policy.

Chair Williams asked Richardson if he would like to respond to the amendment.

Richardson stated that due to the increasing knowledge regarding the impact naming can have on individuals, especially those from minority groups and disadvantaged populations, and due to the complexity of the issue, it may be more appropriate to include the consideration in a standard that can be more easily amended. Richardson noted that the IT Council does not support nor oppose the amendment.

Chair Williams opened the floor to discussion of the amendment; hearing none, she called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 96 in favor, 16 opposed, and 17 abstentions. **The motion to approve the amendment passed.**

Chair Williams opened the floor to discussion of the Proposal for the Establishment of a University Privacy Policy, as amended.

Senator Brosnan, faculty, CMNS expressed concern regarding the requirements related to student coursework. He noted that the requirement for faculty to delete coursework was complicated and stated the need for faculty to have a more simple process.

Gridley stated that the records retention requirements stated in the policy were already in existence, noting that the Privacy Policy referred to the requirements as a matter of clarification.

Senator Blanton, faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering (ENGR) asked why there was a higher level of culpability in the policy for department heads as compared to standard employees. He noted that department heads would have to be found to be knowingly in violation of the policy to be found culpable.

Gridley stated that a department or unit head would still be subject to any penalties that any other individual would be subjected to. Gridley also noted that the language that was being referred to meant that in the event of a security breach or regulatory fine, some costs could be recovered from the unit if the unit head was found to be knowingly and intentionally operating their unit in violation of the policy.

Senator Blanton suggested the addition of language to clarify that unit heads would be subject to the same penalties as other standard employees.

Chair Williams asked Parliamentarian Falvey to comment on the language in the policy.

Falvey noted that the policy as written does reflect that unit heads would be subject to the same penalties as standard employees.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Williams called for a vote on the Proposal for the Establishment of a University Privacy Policy (Senate Document #20-21-15), as amended. The result was 99 in favor, 13 opposed, and 16 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal as amended passed.**

## **SPECIAL ORDER**

---

### **Jack Blanchard, Associate Provost for Enterprise Resource Planning** ***Elevate Project Update***

Senate Chair Williams invited Jack Blanchard, Associate Provost for Enterprise Resource Planning to provide his presentation.

Blanchard provided an overview of the Elevate Project including the problem that the Elevate Project was trying to solve, how the Elevate Project would serve as a solution, progress on the updates, how work was being accomplished, and the individuals involved in the update.

Blanchard stated that the University's Enterprise Resource Programs (ERP), which is what allows the University to complete functions such as the acquisition of budget information, financial transactions, time record entry, recruitment, course registration, and transcript acquisition, was obsolete and

unable to meet the needs of a complex flagship research university. He noted that the systems used by students rely on software that is 30 years old.

Blanchard stated the goals of the Elevate Program and noted that the University would be updating its ERP systems with Workday, a cloud-based software service. Blanchard noted that the software was in use at a number of institutions and would integrate all systems that students, faculty, and staff need during their day-to-day operations, solving issues around data sharing and data accuracy.

Blanchard stated that Workday has regular updates that occur twice annually, noting that over 1100 enhancements had been made to the student Workday system during the previous year's two updates. Blanchard noted the ease of information sharing, opportunities to share data in real-time, multilingual support, and simplified training as further benefits of the software.

Blanchard noted the institutions and companies that the University was partnering with to facilitate the change. Blanchard stated that a core team of staff had been created to work on the update and that advisory groups, 34 project implementation teams, and outreach through town halls, functional overviews, newsletters, websites, and other communications were being utilized to ensure a functional transition.

Blanchard stated that Workday would be implemented in three stages, with the Finance and Human Capital Management portion being implemented in July 2023, the Adaptive Planning portion being implemented in January 2024, and the Student portion being implemented in Fall 2026. Blanchard noted the stages of development for each portion, stated the deliverables for each stage and highlighted the functional design and customer customization sessions deliverables associated with the architect and configure & prototype stages.

Blanchard noted the roles of the executive sponsors, members of the executive steering committee, Elevate core team, advisory groups, and project implementation teams. Blanchard encouraged Senators to stay up to date on developments related to Project Elevate by visiting the [website](#), [subscribing to the newsletter](#), [submitting a question](#), or requesting a presentation.

Chair Williams thanked Blanchard for his presentation and opened the floor to discussion.

Senators asked if the UAchieve student course audit software would be integrated with Workday, why the University of Maryland, Baltimore (UMB) was not one of the named partners transitioning to Workday, and if a shadow system would be run during the testing phase of the implementation. A Senator also stated that the steering committee had good people with a wealth of experience but that it was missing representation from people who have current experience in academic departments and Colleges which may cause unintended consequences.

Blanchard stated that each existing system would be reviewed in order to determine which systems would be integrated with Workday and which systems would be retired. He noted that UMAD had different needs and created its own implementation based on those needs. Blanchard stated that testing would occur in a series over a long period of time to avoid issues when the system is fully implemented. He noted that the advisory groups that had been convened in April 2021 were made up of representatives from a variety of colleges and that they had been engaged in over 1500 hours of meetings to develop future state process designs. Blanchard noted the process underway to ensure that a diverse group of users would continue to be engaged in the development process, including customer confirmation sessions with more than 300 staff members, and identification from Colleges and Divisions regarding the preferred membership of their project implementation teams.

Chair Williams thanked Blanchard for his presentation.

## **SPECIAL ORDER**

---

**Ross Salawitch, Chair, Educational Affairs Committee**

***General Education Diversity Update***

Chair Williams invited Ross Salawitch, Chair of the Educational Affairs Committee to provide his presentation on the General Education Diversity Requirements Update.

Salawitch provided an overview of the events that had led to the Senate's Educational Affairs Committee (EAC) being charged with reviewing revisions to the University's General Education diversity requirement proposed by the Diversity Education Task Force. Salawitch stated that after the on-campus murder of 2nd Lt. Richard Collins III, an African American Bowie State University student by a white University of Maryland (UMD) student, the Provost formed the Diversity Education Task Force (DETF) to make recommendations to the curriculum to foster a more inclusive and respectful campus community.

Salawitch provided a brief overview of the work done by the DETF, the initial charge given to the EAC in December 2020, and the amended charge given to the EAC in November 2021. He noted that the EAC had also received a proposal recommending revisions to the proposed learning outcomes to acknowledge membership in a multilingual society.

Salawitch provided an overview of the preliminary recommendations from the EAC and directed Senators to their meeting materials for further information. Salawitch noted that the wording of the recommendations was preliminary and urged Senators to focus on the principles behind the learning outcomes rather than current specific wording. He stated that the EAC would continue its work by considering the principles and strategies to guide the implementation of its recommendations.

Salawitch stated that the purpose of presenting the committee's progress towards recommendations during this meeting was to gather feedback and suggestions from Senators prior to the establishment of final recommendations. He noted that feedback could also be submitted online and noted the timeline for completion of the committee's work.

Chair Williams thanked Salawitch for his presentation and opened the floor to discussion.

A Senator and member of the EAC provided more information about the conversations that committee members had had regarding centering race and racism in education about diversity.

Chair Williams recognized Chair-Elect Newman who made a motion to extend the meeting by 10 minutes, until 5:10 p.m. The motion was seconded. Chair Williams called for a vote on the motion to extend and noted that it required a  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote in favor. The result was 80 in favor and 31 opposed. **The motion to extend the meeting until 5:10 p.m. passed.**

Several Senators and speakers voiced support for the revisions to the General Education Diversity Requirements.

Senators and speakers discussed the appropriateness of centering race in general education requirements, the importance of the study of language as a way in which to understand global diversity, the benefits of anti-racist education, UMD's history of marginalization as a predominantly

white institution, the value that students, alumni, and other campus community members have gained from learning about race and racism, the importance of carefully selecting the courses that would fulfill the general education requirements in order to ensure that students understand structures of racism, the importance of UMD emphasizing critical race structural competency and literacy, the need for practice-based courses, both from the point of view of students and employers, the need to collect campus data regarding relevant issues, the need to focus on the past and other cultures around the world in addition to the present and racism in America and the idea of adding a third course to the general education diversity requirements to ensure that students can gain a global and historical context.

Senators and speakers asked how the committee plans to ensure that language study is included in the revised general education diversity requirements, if there were any scientific studies showing the efficacy of teaching about race and racism, what practices other higher education institutions were engaged in regarding the teaching of race and racism, how education about caste systems and hierarchies could be included in the general education requirements, and what data was available regarding the dropout rates of students of color across majors and bias incidents taking place on campus.

Senator Pease, undergraduate student, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences made a motion to extend the meeting until 5:30 p.m. The motion was seconded. Chair Williams called for a vote on the motion to extend and noted that it required a  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote in favor. The result was 58 in favor and 17 opposed. **The motion to extend the meeting until 5:30 p.m. passed.**

Chair Williams asked that responses to questions and comments be limited during the discussion in order to allow for time for as many people to share their input as possible.

Salawitch stated that the concerns regarding creating a hierarchy of different kinds of oppression by centering race had been thoroughly considered. Salawitch noted that UMD would be among the first institutions to engage in teaching race and racism in this way. He stated that the EAC had been mindful of the practical implications of the expansion of the practice courses and would be working during the implementation phase to ensure that instructors of those courses were well qualified to teach the subject matter.

Doug Roberts, Member of the Educational Affairs Committee & Associate Dean for General Education stated that the inclusion of courses in general education programs is dependent on the learning outcomes of the course. He noted that the learning outcomes for the diversity general education requirements had not been finalized yet. Roberts stated that members of the School of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures (SLLC) were welcome to be present in discussions regarding the implementation and finalization of learning outcomes to determine how languages courses do or do not align with the updated general education diversity requirements.

Dean Cohen, Office of Undergraduate Studies, stated that research examining graduation rates of students from different races, ethnicities, and genders across campus had been conducted by the DETF, and that the associated reports are available on the [institutional research website](#). He noted that climate surveys across several years had also been analyzed and that the reports associated with the data showed that students of color have very different experiences than white students at UMD.

Senate Chair Williams directed Senators to the Zoom meeting chat for a link where they could submit further feedback regarding the topic.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

---

There was no new business.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

---

The meeting was adjourned at 5:31 p.m.