



CALL TO ORDER

Senate Chair Williams called the meeting to order at 3:16 p.m.

Williams welcomed Senators and stated that due to the number of special order presentations, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) had preemptively extended the meeting until 5:15 p.m. to allow sufficient time for all agenda items. She explained the procedures for the meeting and provided brief instructions on using TurningPoint for voting.

APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 8, 2021 SENATE MINUTES

Williams noted that there had been an error in the minutes where the header of the previous minutes referenced a set of minutes with an inaccurate date. She stated that the minutes had already been corrected to reflect that change.

Williams asked if there were any additional corrections to the September 8, 2021 Senate meeting minutes.

Senator Raugh, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences (CMNS), stated that the time of adjournment noted in the minutes did not reflect the specific end time of the meeting.

Williams noted that the additional revision would be made and asked if there were any additional corrections; hearing none, she asked if there were any objections to approving the minutes as corrected. The minutes were approved as corrected (**in blue**).

The meeting was adjourned at 4:~~xx~~ 30 p.m.

President Pines had not yet arrived so Chair Williams asked if there were any objections to moving to the Chair's Report until he arrived; hearing none, she started the Chair's Report.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR

Chair Williams reported that following the Senate's approval of the Review of the Interim University of Maryland Grading Symbols and Notations Used on Academic Transcripts Policy at the previous Senate meeting, and the President's subsequent approval, the APAS Committee had been automatically charged with a Review of the Interim Emergency Pass/Fail Guidelines.

Williams stated that the guidelines were put in place on an interim basis in January 2021 to address concerns expressed by students about the ongoing impact of the pandemic, but that they would also serve as standard emergency guidelines that could be invoked by the President and Provost during any future emergency.

Williams noted that President Pines had arrived so the Senate would be returning to the original order of the agenda to allow him to provide his briefing.

SPECIAL ORDER: PRESIDENTIAL BRIEFING

Darryll J. Pines, President of the University of Maryland

Chair Williams invited President Pines to provide his briefing to the Senate.

Status of Covid-19 at the University of Maryland (UMD)

President Pines stated that the campus community had achieved a vaccination rate of 98%. He shared data comparing the number of cumulative positive cases per week, starting from the end of August through the beginning of October for both Fall 2020 and Fall 2021 semesters.

- The number of positive cases on campus in Fall 2020 was about 3-4 times higher than cases in Fall 2021, which notes the significance in the context of the increased in-person campus presence.
- The number of people on campus during the Fall 2020 semester was about 20%-25% of the total number of people on campus during the current Fall 2021 semester.
- That data shows that the campus community is safe and that vaccines have worked.
- The campus community has passed the peak period of the Delta variant, and is now reporting 3-5 positive cases a day, as typical for a population of 48,000-50,000 people.
- The campus has remained safe following 3 on-campus football games with large populations ranging from 35,000-45,000 people, and that campus community members should feel comfortable with in-person indoor and outdoor activities.

Cabinet Leadership Update

President Pines stated that there had been several recent changes in senior leadership positions at the University including the following:

- Jennifer King Rice is now the Senior Vice President and Provost.
- Greg Oler is the new Vice President for Finance and Chief Financial Officer (CFO).
- Amitabh Varshney, the current Dean of CMNS, is now also serving as the Interim Vice President for Research. Laurie Locascio, the former Vice President of Research, is undergoing confirmation hearings to become the new Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). Varshney served as Interim Vice President for Research prior to assuming his position as Dean of CMNS.
- Rosalind Hamlett is the new Assistant to the President responsible for working primarily in communications and as the President's speechwriter.

Indicators of Excellence (Teaching, Service, and Research)

President Pines acknowledged the recipients of the Distinguished Staff Service Awards, Distinguished Scholar-Teachers, Distinguished University Professor, the Provost's Excellence for Professional Track (PTK) Faculty Awards, and the Presidential Medal Award from the 2021 convocation. He explained the awards, named the recipients, and acknowledged their accomplishments, praising them as some of the best people at UMD. President Pines stated that the Distinguished University Professor Award was the highest honor that UMD bestows on tenured faculty, and noted that he and Provost Rice hosted a dinner with the 2020 and 2021 recipients the previous evening, in honor of the recipients.

President Pines stated that a 2009 alum from the English Department at UMD, Reginald Dwayne Betts, had received the MacArthur Genius Award, becoming one of the 25 Fellows in the MacArthur 2021 class. President Pines shared a quote from Betts, in which he identifies UMD as the institution that helped him both develop his writing style, and be reminded of opportunities for growth and engagement following a criminal conviction. President Pines noted the degrees that Betts had earned following a period of incarceration. He also noted that Betts was now working on behalf of

incarcerated persons in various criminal systems, helping them transition back to society through education and opportunity acquisition.

President's Distinguished Forums

President Pines noted that the President's Distinguished Forums are a part of a class that he is teaching called "Grand Challenges of Our Time (UNIV 110)," in addition to being events open to the campus community. He stated that forums focus on social injustice, environmental injustice, criminal justice, climate change, and similar topics. He also noted that the forums were available on [UMD's YouTube page](#). President Pines provided an overview of the forums that had already taken place and the forums that were scheduled for the rest of the Fall 2021 semester.

IonQ- A College Park Success Story

President Pines shared the sequence of events that led to the creation of IonQ as a startup company at the University in 2016, and the sequence of events that then led to IonQ going public on the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) on October 1, 2021 as an Initial Public Offering (IPO). He also provided information about the establishment of the partnership between the Physics Department and NIST, the hiring of Dr. Christopher Monroe, the research done into quantum theories, the construction of the Physical Sciences Complex, and the establishment of IonQ as a startup firm in 2016.

President Pines stated that IonQ has the ability to develop a quantum computer that is faster and better able to handle more computations than any computer currently in existence.

- Staff had expended over 3,600 hours of time into the company.
- IonQ has submitted over 22 invention disclosures to the UMD Technology Office, and 75 patent applications which were paid for by the corporation and venture capitalists.
- President Pines stated that after the first patent was issued in 2018, the first venture capitalist investment of \$20 million was acquired, ultimately helping IonQ go public on the NYSE.
- As an attendee at the IPO launch, Pines noted that the day had been a proud moment for UMD, the Physics Department, CMNS, and IonQ. He stated that 1/3 of IonQ is made up of UMD community members, including post-doctoral students, PhDs, and bachelor of science students.

President Pines provided an overview of some of the implications around the potential applications for quantum computing:

- Quantum computing can reduce development time for chemicals and pharmaceuticals with simulations;
- It solves optimization problems with unprecedented speed and scale;
- It can accelerate autonomous vehicles with quantum AI;
- It will transform cybersecurity; and
- It can enable rapid financial transactions.

Gamera Project

President Pines provided a brief overview of the Gamera Project, which is an initiative that he had started and concluded shortly before assuming his role as President. He noted that with the help of colleagues, he had also recently completed and published a book, "Gamera: A Human Powered Helicopter - In Pursuit of an Aviation Milestone," which tells the story of the Gamera Project. President Pines stated that the project had started in 2008, and that its maiden flight took place in 2011, prior to many record-breaking flights in 2012 involving both graduate and undergraduate students from the A. James Clark School of Engineering.

Chair Williams thanked President Pines for his presentation and opened the floor to questions. Williams stated that there was only time for 1-2 questions.

Senator Lekic, faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences (CMNS), asked President Pines how the Western Gateway Project, involving the deforestation of the Guilford Woods region on campus, aligned with the long-term development goals of the University, which highlight the importance of preserving wooded spaces and promoting a sustainable campus. They also stated that they were aware of student opposition to the project from both undergraduate and graduate students. President Pines stated that the proposed development of the region was in response to a long-standing need for on-campus affordable housing for graduate students. He noted this was an emotional issue that people felt very strongly about, and stated that while the primary concerns about the project were around issues of deforestation, greenhouse gases, sustainability, and stormwater retention, the technical arguments in support of the project contain information about plans to alleviate those concerns. President Pines stated that updates regarding the status of the project, as well as answers to questions about sustainability, deforestation, and stormwater retention as it relates to the project, would be shared with the campus community in the near future. He also noted his strong commitment to the environment and his equally strong commitment to addressing graduate students' need for affordable housing.

Senator Perkey, graduate student, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences (BSOS), stated that the Graduate Student Government (GSG) would be hosting a presentation with the proposed developer, Gilbane Development, on October 15, 2021, and invited those at the meeting to attend if they were interested. She noted that the GSG was concerned about the misinformation being circulated regarding how graduate students felt about the project, because they were generally in support of it. Senator Perkey asked President Pines if UMD is listed as an arboretum. President Pines confirmed that it is an arboretum.

Williams thanked President Pines for his time and he thanked Williams and the University Senate for the opportunity to brief them.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR (CONTD.)

Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Update

Chair Williams stated that the SEC had met on September 20, 2021 and approved the agenda for the Senate meeting. She noted that the SEC had also considered the Interim Criminal Background Check Policy, which was approved by the President on an interim basis pending Senate review effective October 1, 2021. She stated that the SEC had voted to jointly charge the Faculty and Staff Affairs Committees with a review of the interim policy, in line with standard procedures.

Williams stated that the SEC had also considered two proposals at its last meeting. Williams noted that the first was a request related to the potential Western Gateway Development of Guilford Woods. The proposers requested that the October 7, 2021 Senate meeting agenda include two presentations, one pro and one con - related to the Development. In addition, the proposal requested that the Senate convene a task force that would be responsible for conducting an independent assessment on environmental and sustainability factors of the Development.

Williams noted that, as President Pines had stated, this was a fraught issue due to the need to balance the needs of graduate students with environmental concerns. Williams stated that in considering the proposal, the SEC relied on the University of Maryland Plan of Organization for Shared Governance (the Plan), which directs the Senate to carry out the formulation and review of policies and regulations, and identifies twenty-three (23) roles and responsibilities assigned to the

Senate. The SEC used those criteria, rather than the merit of the proposal, to evaluate whether the requests in the proposal principally fell under the Senate's purview. Williams stated that after substantial discussion, the SEC had determined that since the requested presentations would not involve an assessment of policies or regulations, it did not fall under any of the provisions in Article 1.3 of the Plan, and so did not fall under the Senate's purview. The SEC voted on a motion that no further action should be taken on the proposal by the Senate. The vote on the motion passed.

Williams stated that the second proposal was related to the Student Fee Process, which requested a number of changes associated with the processes and procedures regarding the student fee review process. In discussing this proposal, the SEC considered the context of the new state law passed by Governor Hogan, SB895 - University System of Maryland - Student Fees - Review and Spending. Williams stated that this law, which took effect on July 1, 2021, requires the President to present information on any mandatory or non-mandatory student fees and any changes to the use of revenue collected for specific fees to the student fees committee.

Williams stated that the Senate leadership had consulted with the administration prior to the SEC meeting to discuss the concerns raised in the proposal, as well as the best practice model that it highlighted. She stated that the administration had indicated that it was receptive to encouraging University fee advisory bodies to follow the best practices.

Williams stated that the SEC had considered these different factors, and decided that since the new state law is in the beginning stages of implementation at the University, creating a shifting baseline, and the administration is willing to make modifications to its current fee advisory bodies, it would be premature for the Senate to take immediate action on this proposal. The SEC agreed instead to forward the proposal for administrative action to the new Vice President for Finance & CFO, Greg Oler, to take appropriate action. Williams stated that this allows Oler's unit to consider the issues raised in the proposal while they implement the provisions in the new state law, collect any relevant data, and put best practices in place prior to reporting back to the SEC about what actions were taken during the 2021-2022 academic year. She noted that the SEC would reassess the process after the 2021-2022 fee review cycle to see whether the concerns raised in the proposal warrant further Senate action.

Volunteers for the Nominations Committee

Williams stated that outgoing Senators would soon receive an email about volunteering for the Senate Nominations Committee.

Williams stated that every year, the Nominations Committee solicits nominations for the Senate Chair-Elect and membership on the Executive Committee, the Committee on Committees, and other University-wide committees and councils. She stated that the Senate relies on the good judgment of the members of the Nominations Committee to present candidates that reflect the quality and diversity of the campus community. Williams noted that the committee would meet between January and April.

Williams noted that those who are interested in serving on the committee should look for an email with a link to a Google form, and complete the link as soon as possible. She noted that those interested may contact the Senate Office Staff for any needed additional information or assistance. Williams stated that the Senate will vote on the Nominations Committee's membership in December.

New Deans

Williams welcomed the two newest deans at the University as voting members of the Senate: Dean Dawn Jourdan, School of Architecture, Planning, & Preservation, and Dean Samuel Graham, A. James Clark School of Engineering.

TECHNICAL REVISIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND DISABILITY & ACCESSIBILITY POLICY AND PROCEDURES (SENATE DOCUMENT #21-22-09) (INFORMATION)

Chair Williams stated that the revisions to the University of Maryland Disability & Accessibility Policy and Procedures were made to update the information in the policy with the new Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Coordinator's contact information, and a generic reflector for the email address that is directed to the new ADA Coordinator, so that a revision to the policy does not have to be made every time the person in the role changes. She also noted that broken links in the policy were updated, and that the technical revision was reviewed and approved by the Senate leadership, and subsequently by the President on September 21, 2021.

Williams restated the need for the Senate to complete all business on the agenda. 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. Williams stated that this would ensure that all those who wish to speak have an opportunity to do so without further extending the meeting. 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 rule was put in effect, and she proceeded with the meeting.

PCC PROPOSAL TO DISCONTINUE THE UPPER-DIVISION CERTIFICATE IN SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIETY (SENATE DOCUMENT #21-22-08) (ACTION)

Valerie Orlando, Chair of the Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee (PCC), presented the PCC Proposal to Discontinue the Upper-Division Certificate in Science, Technology and Society (Senate Document #21-22-08) and provided background information.

Chair Williams opened the floor for discussion of the proposal, noting the two minute speaker time limit; hearing none, she called for a vote on the PCC Proposal to Discontinue the Upper-Division Certificate in Science, Technology and Society (Senate Document #21-22-08). The result was 119 in favor, 3 opposed, and 9 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Williams stated that the Provost was not yet available to provide her presentation so she asked if there were any objections to moving to the Privacy Policy presentation; hearing no objections, she moved to Agenda Item #8.

SPECIAL ORDER

Derek Richardson, Chair, Information Technology (IT) Council

Joseph Gridley, Chief Data Privacy Officer

Update on the UMD Privacy Policy

Chair Williams invited Derek Richardson, Chair of the Information Technology (IT) Council, and Joseph Gridley, Chief Data Privacy Officer, to give their presentation on the draft privacy policy.

Richardson stated that the IT Council had been charged with developing a privacy policy for the University, in line with similar policies at peer institutions, and that Gridley had provided support in creating the draft policy.

Gridley provided an overview of the key elements and structure of the draft policy including: information on definitions of privacy, a timeline of work done so far, concepts that still need to be addressed, privacy principles, expectations of privacy, policy violations, and next steps.

He noted that the language currently in the University of Maryland Policy on Acceptable Use of Information Technology Resources regarding user privacy was no longer sufficient in the context of the increased use of data and increasingly complicated data sets and systems. Gridley stated that based on industry best practices, and national and international frameworks and regulations, the University is lacking a policy with clearly articulated principles, expectations, an implementation process, rules for exceptions, and consequences for violations.

Gridley's overview included the following key points in the draft policy:

- Definitions of each of the privacy principles.
 - Equity is included as a core principle to ensure that recent examples of other companies and institutions making prejudicial decisions based on data analyses from artificial intelligence would not be the practice at the University.
- User's reasonable expectation of privacy:
 - Data is subject to regulatory and university obligations, such as the Maryland Public Information Act and academic and employment misconduct investigations.
 - In the event of a cybersecurity attack, appropriate personnel would work with affected users to determine what data might have been shared.
- Standards associated with the Privacy Policy will be built by the campus community through shared governance, because the IT Council plans to solicit volunteers for a task force that will help draft the standards.
- Exceptions will be granted through a specific process based on consistent, transparent data, and requests for exceptions and relevant decisions will be documented and recorded.
- Policy violations will follow the same process as any other policies, with the exception that a consequence would potentially be able to be applied to a whole unit if the unit was knowingly operating in violation of the policy and its standards.

Gridley encouraged engagement from Senators and stated that the final policy and recommendations would be presented to the Senate at its meeting in December. He stated that the development of the associated standards would likely take place in Spring 2022 and he provided a reminder about the opportunity to volunteer for the associated task force.

Williams opened the floor to discussion of the draft policy.

Senator Hedberg, faculty, Division of Research (VPR), asked if the Privacy Policy would address instances in which faculty members are engaged in restricted research and are holding government clearances that require the signing away of some rights to privacy. Gridley stated that a contract with the Department of Defense (DOD) would supersede a University policy due to existing legal obligations. He noted that interaction between the Privacy Policy and research would have significant crossover and stated that collaboration would be taking place with existing research structures and support groups to ensure that a comprehensive policy is made without the creation of layering of numerous policies.

Williams asked if there were any additional questions or comments; hearing none, she thanked Richardson and Gridley for their presentation, noting that it would help prepare Senators for the upcoming vote on the privacy policy later in the semester.

Williams asked if there were any objections to moving back to the previous agenda item since the Provost had arrived to make her presentation. Hearing no objections, she moved to Agenda Item #7.

SPECIAL ORDER

Jennifer King Rice, Senior Vice President & Provost

Strategic Plan Update

Chair Williams invited Provost Rice to provide her presentation.

Provost Rice introduced herself and thanked Senators for the invitation and for their investment in the University Senate and the University's system of shared governance. Provost Rice provided an overview of her background, stating that her academic career at the University had started in the College of Education as an assistant professor of education policy. She stated that her work was primarily grounded in the field of economics, and was complemented by studies in philosophy and Africana Studies, because all three perspectives were essential to understanding structural inequality in society.

Provost Rice stated that while many economists of education look to academic achievement test scores as their primary outcome, her cross-disciplinary knowledge has enabled her to recognize broader purposes of public education. She noted some of those broader purposes as producing the next generation of individuals who can participate in a democracy, creating the ability to respect and work across differences, and the ability to be economically self-sufficient and contribute to the good of society. Rice stated her continued interest in broader outcomes as Provost, noting that her focus extended beyond fiscal resources. Provost Rice stated that while aligning fiscal resources with priorities and goals was important, allocating human capital, social capital, space, and time appropriately was also important.

Provost Rice stated that she had progressed through each rank as a tenure-track faculty member at the University before moving into a variety of leadership roles. She stated that she had served as the ADVANCE Professor for the College of Education, the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Faculty Affairs, and the Chair of the APT Committee on campus. She provided an overview of her commitments to leadership and emphasized the importance of excellence and equity, noting that inclusive excellence involves both recognition of diversity of thinking and diversity of background, and equitable policies that promote those things. Provost Rice noted the importance of the impact of actions and work on scholarly communities, real life communities, and the larger world. She also stated the importance of collaboration and the need for interdisciplinary collaboration to address grand challenges.

Provost Rice discussed the relevance of threats that the University and higher education as an enterprise are facing, including the ability to provide access and inclusivity, the ability to innovate and respond, and relevance. She noted that the threats could be overcome as the community works to re-imagine its future and discussed potential solutions.

Provost Rice stated that the idea that the University is currently on the edge of possibility was being heavily considered during the strategic planning process. She provided multiple examples of what she meant by the edge of possibility including:

- The University is positioned to contribute to the next generation of teachers, scientists and citizens who can save the world at a critical moment when the climate is in more danger than ever before.

- Researchers at the University are leading the way in preparedness and prevention of future pandemics while we continue to navigate the current pandemic.
- The University has more expertise than the vast majority of institutions to create an anti-racist society, to help with racial injustice and inequities that our society continues to face.
- The University has recruited a more diverse and academically talented undergraduate class, but there are still opportunities to expand access in Maryland, in the USA, and internationally.
- Provost Rice noted the members of the campus community have a unique opportunity to connect education and research to grand challenges by investing in civic engagement in the nation's capital, and an opportunity to enhance and demonstrate the impact of work being done at the University in a time where the relevance of higher education is being questioned.

Provost Rice noted that while much of the potential of this work will not be recognized until after her term as Provost, it was important to embrace the possibilities available to the University.

Provost Rice provided an overview of the principles used to develop the Strategic Plan and the work done thus far.

- The Strategic Plan is grounded in the six guiding principles of excellence, diversity, equity and inclusion, impact, innovation, collaboration, and service to humanity, which are present in all initiatives proposed as part of the Plan.
- The six Pillar Committees working on the Strategic Plan are Academic Excellence; Discovery, Creativity and Innovation; Strategic Partnerships; Access and Student Success; Operations and Resources; and Student Experience.
- The committee chairs are leading large and diverse groups of faculty, staff, students and external stakeholders in envisioning big ideas for the future of the University, and the work of the six Pillar Committees is also supported by the work of a catalyst committee.
- Huron is the consultant group that has been helping the groups with gathering data and process organization.
- Over 250 stakeholders have been engaged and directly involved in the process. The committees have collected and reviewed multiple sources of information including internal data, peer comparison data, environmental scans, and a summary of stakeholder themes from focus groups before conducting a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) Analysis with the goal of setting key priorities and strategic initiatives.
- Five environmental trends and general conclusions of the SWOT analysis include:
 - Impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic, demographic and enrollment trends, the value and nature of post-secondary education, external funding, and workforce trends.
- Six cross cutting themes identified in the SWOT analysis include:
 - diversity, equity and inclusion; the size and scope of UMD;
 - the location and reach of UMD;
 - grand challenges facing society;
 - innovation and collaboration; and
 - opportunities to serve and meaningfully engage UMD's external and internal stakeholders.

Provost Rice noted that they had developed a Strategic Plan website that was made specifically for the planning process and explained how campus community members could engage in the process of formulating the Strategic Plan by responding to the question of the week. She noted that responses were being analyzed by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment (IRPA) for use by the Pillar Committees.

Provost Rice provided a list of examples of the ideas that had been suggested by the Pillar Committees to date. She noted that the ideas would be a combination of transformative and incremental. Provost Rice stated that once the Pillar Committees submitted their final priorities and initiatives, she would review and analyze the information with President Pines to coordinate ideas into an actionable plan.

Provost Rice encouraged continued engagement from campus community members, noting that forums would be held to solicit feedback and share findings. She also thanked the chairs and members of the Pillar Committees for their work.

Senator Li, faculty, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences (BSOS), asked if there were any specific measures of programs under consideration in the Strategic Plan to advance globalization and internationalization. Provost Rice stated that globalization and internationalization would be a part of the Strategic Plan and that there were members on the Pillar Committees thinking about partnerships and initiatives for the university community to advance globalization efforts. She stated that the issue was important to her and to President Pines, and there is opportunity to link globalization and internationalization with the issue of grand challenges.

Senator Orlando, faculty, College of Arts & Humanities (ARHU), asked if the Strategic Plan included a vision to address the subpar conditions of certain buildings on campus. Provost Rice stated that the condition of the buildings on campus was a problem, and that work would begin on a new facilities master plan during the 2022-2023 academic year.

Senator Lin, faculty, College of Education (EDUC), stated that the University's Mission Statement and the guiding principles of the Pillar Committees did not include any language considering nature and the environment. Lin asked how campus community members can be more creative and bold when discussing the future in strategic plans, especially in relation to solving grand challenges. Provost Rice stated that a theme coming from the Pillar Committees was that existing structures were serving as barriers to bold ideas and interdisciplinary collaboration. She noted that the committees were proposing significant ideas to address this issue and that the campus community needed to be prepared for those ideas. She stated that methods of doing work would need to be reinvented and that APT and AEP standards would need to be updated to reflect an institutional commitment to interdisciplinary work across colleges. Rice also stated that she had been considering methods of facilitating interdisciplinary collaboration with the goal of addressing grand challenges, and thanked Lin for her suggestions on including the environment in considerations.

Chair Williams thanked Provost Rice for her presentation and noted the value of Senators hearing about her vision. She stated that due to time constraints, those who still had questions for the Provost should submit them in the Zoom chat to be forwarded to her.

Provost Rice thanked Chair Williams and the Senate for its time.

Williams stated that before moving on to the next agenda item, she wanted to encourage Senators to provide any additional feedback that they may have on the draft Privacy Policy as soon as possible. She noted that the Senate would be voting on the final version of the policy at its December meeting, so this is their opportunity to provide feedback and potentially help the IT Council revise the draft policy before it is finalized. Williams encouraged Senators to consult with their units and their colleagues, and get feedback submitted as soon as possible to umd-privacy@umd.edu.

SPECIAL ORDER

Sharon La Voy, Assistant Vice President, Institutional Research, Planning, & Assessment
Alan Socha, Assistant Director for Institutional Research, Planning, & Assessment
Course Evaluation Implementation Update

Senate Chair Williams invited Sharon La Voy, Assistant Vice President, Institutional Research, Planning, & Assessment, and Alan Socha, Assistant Director for Institutional Research, Planning, & Assessment to provide their presentation on the Course Evaluation Implementation Update.

La Voy thanked Chair Williams for the opportunity and the course evaluation advisory group for their time and attention. La Voy provided background information on the history of the course evaluation review and implementation and introduced Socha to provide the presentation.

Socha provided an overview of the work that the course evaluation advisory group had done including, data and psychometrics, feedback from the pilot of the new course evaluation tool, and conclusions.

The process for drafting course and instructor items included:

- A pilot in Spring 2021 using a total of 146 course sections taught by 120 different instructors that included each College.
 - 2,137 students had submitted evaluations, resulting in the receipt of 2,703 evaluations as some students were enrolled in multiple courses in the pilot.
 - The 29% response rate, which was lower than the 37% response rate to the official course evaluation, was likely due in part to the fact that students were given both evaluations and may have chosen the official one due to a belief that it would be more important.
 - The group of instructors and students who participated in the pilot were representative of all instructors and students at the University.
 - Representation was proportional, except for the slight over representation of white female instructors and students, noting the historical trend of white female students responding to campus surveys at slightly higher rates.

Socha provided an overview of reliability and group differences as they relate to research, as well as information regarding how they were assessed in the course of this work.

- All items met the benchmark of having an alpha of at least a .90, with course items having an alpha of .90, and instructor items having an alpha of .95.
- Socha stated that the working group had had positive results both in their analyses of correlation between items, and in their analyses assessing the tool's ability to measure multiple aspects of the course experience. He stated that the working group had analyzed group differences by student level, student sex, student race, instructor sex, instructor race and various interactions of those things.
- All statistically significant differences were within .30 on a scale of 0 to 4.
- All groups had responded slightly more positively than white males to all course items, except for one.
- White female instructors had received slightly more positive feedback on every item with a difference of .30.
- Graduate students responded slightly more positively to cognitive engagement and rigor, noting the expectation that graduate student courses would be more engaging and rigorous than undergraduate courses.

- Undergraduate students had responded slightly more positively to clear grading expectations, noting that undergraduate courses tend to have clearer expectations than a graduate course.
- The pilot also included an open-ended question to students to gather their feedback.

Socha stated that surveys were sent to, and focus groups were held with, instructors who had access to results of both the pilot and official evaluations. He stated that while there was some negative, neutral, and unrelated feedback, most student feedback was positive.

Socha provided an overview of instructor feedback on the pilot including:

- Instructors indicated that they did not receive helpful feedback about the classroom climate on the old evaluation, but did on the new, and that instructors also learned something different on the new evaluation tool.
- Instructors expressed that they valued the feedback more on the new evaluation tool, and felt that it was at least as fair if not more than fair than the old tool.
- Socha directed Senators to refer to their meeting materials for excerpts of quotes from students and instructors.

Socha provided an overview of the remaining work that needs to be done moving forward:

- The campus community needs to be educated on the new evaluation and its implementation.
- TA items need to be finalized.
- College and department item banks need to be created.
- Documentation and training on interpreting the results of the evaluation for instructors, chairs, administrators, and review committees need to be created.
- Training resources for students need to be created.
- Creation of data monitoring data procedures with a focus on unpacking race/ethnicity differences.

Chair Williams thanked Socha for his presentation and opened the floor to discussion and questions, noting the 2-minute time limit.

Senator Burroughs, undergraduate student, College of Arts & Humanities (ARHU), asked if there would be any inclusion of non-binary and gender non-conforming people within the evaluation tool, stating the importance of acknowledging those biases. Socha stated that the working group had been limited to the data that was collected by the University, which used the binary male/female options, but if additional data regarding non-binary and gender non-conforming people became available, it would be analyzed.

Chair Williams asked if there were any additional questions or comments; hearing none, she thanked La Voy and Socha for the presentation and expressed support for the work done thus far and anticipation of additional information and data in the future.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.