The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. President Hrabowski provided the President’s Report. Professor Forestiere gave a great talk at last Saturday’s “Just for Juniors” program.

The legislative session went well. We received most of the funding that was in the governor’s budget, including the final $35 million for the PAHB for a total of approximately $155 million. We will begin planning for the new front entrance to campus. Two million has been allotted for planning and we hope to break ground next year. Total funding for this project will be $12 million.

We’ve had many faculty receiving awards and accolades. Jim Grubb, Tulay Adali, Suzanne Ostrand-Rosenberg and Nagaraj Neerchal all received Board of Regents Awards. The USM presents seventeen awards and we received four. About ten percent of the System faculty is here at UMBC. Constantine Vaporis received the Presidential Research Award and Manil Suri the Presidential Teaching Award. Dr. Vaporis also received the 2013 Franklin R. Buchanan Prize for Curricular Materials for Voices of Early Modern Japan: Contemporary Accounts of Daily Life during the Age of the Shoguns from the Association for Asian Studies and the Committee for Teaching About Asia (CTA).

Retiring Dean John Jeffries will be delivering this year’s Low Lecture in History on May 1st. Dean Jeffries came to UMBC in 1973 as a member of the History faculty and has given much to the campus. He will be sorely missed. Vice President for Research Geoff Summers will also be retiring as will Bill Rothstein in Sociology. The Ancient Studies Department held a luncheon last week in honor of newly retired and retiring faculty, Carolyn Koehler, Rudy Storch, Walt Sherwin and Jay Freyman. It was really impressive to see the turnout for this event.

Graduate Commencement is on May 22nd. Dr. Roger W. Ferguson, President and Chief Executive Officer of TIAA-CREF will be the speaker. Undergraduate Commencement is May 23rd and the speaker will be Nancy Cantor, Chancellor and President of Syracuse University.

There were no questions or comments and this concluded the President’s Report.

Dr. Rous began the Provost’s Report by thanking everyone for all they do and reminded senators that Dean Jeffries will give the Low Lecture at 4:00 p.m. in the PAHB on May 1st. Retiring Vice President Geoffrey Rous will be honored at a reception on May 15th from 4:00 - 6:00 p.m. on the 7th floor of the library.

As most people know, the governor sends his proposed budget to the legislature that is empowered to cut but not add to it. This year the USM was fortunate to avoid cuts for the first time in five years. Mandatory costs will be covered and there will be some enhancement funding. These monies are directed at student success and economic development, including technology transfers. We will be required to establish metrics to measure results in these areas and report in two years and again in four years.
The Shared Services Centers Task Force has delivered their final report and recommendations. The report is available online through the Provost web page or the MyUMBC Shared Services Centers Group. Everyone is encouraged to read the report. The administration will be soliciting feedback and answering questions beginning with open forums this Thursday. Forum times are designated to the colleges and administrative offices but anyone can attend any forum. Recommendations will be discussed at the town hall meetings and the provost will continue to work with campus leaders to move the process forward.

Our collaboration with UM,B has expanded through a seed grant program. Dr. Julia Ross joined the Provost Office to work on this strategic partnership focused on research and students. Dr. Ross was introduced and provided senators with a quick update. The first round of seed grant proposals were due on March first. Forty-two proposals with co-PIs from UM,B and UMBC were received. Eighteen were from the College of Natural and Mathematical Sciences, eighteen from the College of Engineering and Information Technology and six from the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. Reviewers are being lined up now and awards will be announced by June 1st. The first round of reviews will be facilitated by UM,B but there will be one reviewer from each school for each proposal. Proposals will be scored quantitatively and PIs will be given qualitative feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of their proposals. Reviewers will come together as a panel in May to rank the proposals that will then be given to Provost Rous and Bruce Jarrell, Chief Academic and Research Officer and Senior Vice President of UM,B. In response to questions from senators the provost noted that this is intended to be an annual rather than one-time program and will award a maximum of $75,000 this first year. The original target was to fund 5 proposals and both institutions will equally fund the effort. Senator Liebman asked if there has been much impact felt from the collaboration of UMCP with UM,B. The provost responded in the negative and noted that the number of proposals we received is similar to the number they received although they are able to fund roughly ten proposals. We are doing very well given our resources. Keeping in mind that UM,B is not just the School of Medicine, there are opportunities for collaboration across the board. For example, the School of Pharmacy is interested in drug abuse in seniors and we are doing similar work here. UM,B has a wealth of data to be mined and we have the expertise to do it. The collaborative seed grant program with UMCB and UM,B is more defined from year-to-year and is focused on biomedical research and technology transfer. We decided to leave things more broadly based to reach beyond the School of Medicine. If interested in collaborating, please get in touch with Dr. Ross. She and her colleagues can help.

The provost was asked about the Shared Services Centers. Why are we reorganizing, was it precipitated by a specific event? What data do we have that indicates they will address this event? Is the listening process supposed to help us decide if we should move forward with shared services centers or get us used to the idea? The provost responded to these questions by explaining that the precipitating factor is our own growth over the last ten to twenty years. We have grown in all areas and it behooves us to examine the extent to which our current business practices have kept pace and ask if they will keep pace in the future. When we were small a decentralized structure where faculty and staff in the departments interacted with central offices worked but as we grew that changed. Shared Services Centers usually function as an interface between departments and central administration. He noted that 25% of the transactions on this
campus are related to payroll. There are multiple steps within the payroll process and shared services centers may be appropriate to help manage the process. First we have to understand our business processes and what is involved in each of them. What are the weaknesses and strengths? Where are the processes now? Shared services centers have worked at other universities and in investigating their potential we have looked at best practices.

Deficits and surpluses on campus are also an issue. We have examined this closely and the problems are across the board. There are problems in PeopleSoft, issues with matching funds that were never transferred, training and development issues and problems with staff, faculty and chairs having to manage many different processes. We have done the analysis and cannot point at any one thing. If we look at the big picture it is clear that we have not kept up with our growth. In good faith we have to look at where we are now and where we are going.

This concluded the Provost’s report. The report of the Faculty Senate President was next. We have begun the period during which faculty can self-nominate for service on shared governance committees. Please encourage faculty members in your departments to complete the form and return it to the Nominating Committee.

The Faculty Senate President’s final Open Door Meeting will take place on Wednesday, April 24th from noon until 1:00 p.m. in the Fireside Lounge. Please come by to chat or discuss shared governance. There will be refreshments.

Campus visits by candidates for the Vice President for Research and the Dean of the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences have been completed. Senators are encouraged to share feedback with the search committee chairs, Anupam Joshi and Leslie Morgan, respectively.

Retiring Dean John Jeffries will present the Low Lecture on May 1st at 4:00 p.m. in the Performing Arts and Humanities Building (PAHB), with a reception to follow. A reception honoring retiring Vice President for Research, Geoffrey Summers will be held on Wednesday, May 15th from 4:00 - 6:00 p.m. in the AOK Library, 7th floor.

This concluded the Faculty Senate President’s Report. Reporting on behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Tim Nohe read the section on election of officers from the Faculty Senate By-Laws. In accordance with the process, the Executive Committee has produced a slate of nominees for the offices of President and Vice President of the Faculty Senate. Current Vice President, Dr. Kathleen Carroll (Economics), has been nominated for President. Dr. Mary Stuart, Professor and Director of UMBC’s Health Administration and Policy Program has been nominated as Vice President. The Executive Committee invites other nominations for these offices. Those interested in nominating candidates for Faculty Senate President and Vice President should convey those nominations to Lynn Knazik before the next Faculty Senate meeting on May 14th.

The minutes from February 12th were approved unanimously. The minutes from March 12th were approved with one abstention.
The Executive Committee continues to monitor the progress of the Shared Services Centers Task Force and will continue to work with the provost to communicate information and developments on the recommendations.

The Executive Committee also received an update from the workgroup tasked with piloting the SIR II course evaluation instrument. Beginning this semester the instrument will be piloted in three separate phases in both paper and online versions. The Faculty Senate will receive regular updates.

Matt Baker clarified the Executive Committee report on the SIR II for senators. The pilot reflects the vote of the Faculty Senate recommending the SIR II instrument. It will begin this spring with selected classes doing paper versions. This first phase of the pilot will be limited to a few classes and will test implementation from administrative handling of the instrument to interactions with ETS. Faculty that have volunteered to pilot the instrument in their classes, which are typically large, will not be affected by the change in evaluation instrument. Summer classes that do not typically use course evaluations will pilot both the online and paper versions on a wider scale. In the fall, a more rigorous pilot using online vs. paper evaluations will be conducted. When asked if the pilot would look at variances between small classes and large classes, Dr. Baker explained that the initial pilot is being conducted solely for a look at the actual implementation process. Kathleen Carroll noted that faculty teaching in the summer could be coming up for promotion or tenure and asked if any thought had been given to the potential impact of the new instrument on these people. Dr. Baker responded that the committee will meet with the Director of Summer and Winter Programs to discuss this. He reiterated that the pilot will be done first on paper and then comparing paper to online. The experiences of each of these will be considered carefully before moving forward in the fall.

The Executive Committee also received an update on issues of email/data privacy in light of recent events at Harvard. We continue discussions with Jack Seuss and the General Counsel on the best way to communicate our policy to the senate. We are currently guided by the “Responsible Computing Policy of 1996” and federal and state law. Additional information will be provided to the senate in May.

This concluded the report of the Executive Committee. The APB committee report was next.

Bruce Walz reported for APB. The provost did a presentation on the planning process at the last APB meeting. The committee will continue to be involved in this process.

Matt Baker, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) gave the committee’s report. The FAC met and continues to discuss to action items for future meetings. First is a possible change to UFRC membership to better represent departments and colleges across campus. Currently COEIT is not represented except through Professional members. Second the committee is reviewing the DP&TC policy language that permits the UFRC to consult outside sources on P&T evaluations concerning national recognition.
Senators were presented with a motion from the FAC to amend Section 6.3.3.4 DPT&C Report, which describes the criteria for the report. The FAC is suggesting that this sentence be added to the existing language. “Reports that fail to meet the criteria described above may be returned by the respective Dean accompanied by a documented request for the addition of missing items.” This addition specifically delineates the power of the deans to return reports to the DP&TC if they do not meet criteria. When this motion was introduced at the last Faculty Senate meeting, there was concern that it was not specific enough. In response, the sentence was amended to specify that the reason for the return had to be documented.

Tim Nohe clarified for senators that the policy being discussed was current.

There were many questions and comments from senators. A number of these reflected the wording of the statement from the Faculty Handbook that was not a part of the current motion. Comments on the current motion included general concerns in that senator’s department, and many comment were concerned with how the dates in the process would be affected.

A senator expressed her department’s concern that revisions could get out of hand and suggested there should be a maximum of 1-2 pages of revisions. Dr. Baker agreed this was a legitimate concern and that people do not want to rewrite. The proposed motion gives the deans explicit authority to request additions to the report. In practice, the deans meet with DP&TC chairs before the process begins and this should come up as a matter of course. In that sense, DP&TC chairs should want their reports to meet the “letter of the law” and Dean Jeffries clarified that the amendment specified information that was missing, not in the incorrect form.

A motion was made and seconded to continue the discussion beyond time.

The Faculty Affairs Committee also is concerned about timing. Dr. Baker believes the change does not so much create a timing issue but an incentive to do the report correctly the first time. He reminded senators that the committee is acting in response to a request from the UFRC. Dean Jeffries noted that there is nothing in the policy that relieves the deans of meeting the deadline but if it became necessary, the dean could ask the provost for an extension of the deadline. The dean’s office is also concerned that CVs are not in the right format when submitted.

President Nohe proposed a motion to return the motion to FAC. The motion was made and seconded and a vote was taken. The vote passed with Vice President Carroll counting 15 FOR, 7 AGAINST, and 4 ABSTAINING. Mrs. Knazik’s count was 15 FOR, 8 AGAINST, and 3 ABSTAINING. President Nohe expressed some concern that there was a discrepancy in the vote count but a second vote was not taken.

At this point discussion of the motion began again. In response to an issue on including both the dean and the UFRC, Patrice McDermott clarified that the UFRC has the ability to ask for clarification by DP&TC or the Dean.

Dr. Baker was asked to read the policy aloud so that everyone understood what it said. Dean Jeffries stated that protection of the process is important for the University, department, and
candidate and that it should be compliance with the Faculty Handbook. Provost Rous also commented on the issue of compliance. The Faculty senate has previously established the responsibilities of the DP&TC and the UFRC has noted a “drifting away” from compliance with those responsibilities. The FAC motion is attempting to promote the compliance that is desired by all parties. There are tight deadlines and these are taken seriously. That said, sometimes it is necessary to extend those deadlines for certain circumstances. If the provost receives such a request it will be considered and accommodated, if justified.

President Nohe noted that the membership seemed to be mired in discussion and it had gone over time again. A second is not required for a straight up and down vote to approve or return the motion to the FAC for input. In a vote of 14 FOR, 7 AGAINST and 2 ABSTAINING, the motion offered by the Faculty Affairs Committee was approved.

The Graduate Council report was next on the agenda. Senators received a copy of the report electronically prior to the meeting. The council approved two new courses and several new faculty. Nancy Shelton was approved for regular faculty status, Mark Georganopoulos for associate faculty status and Snajeev Ahuja for special status (3 years).

Terrance Worchesky provided the Undergraduate Council (UGC) report. Senators received the report electronically prior to the meeting. In addition to the usual run of approvals, the council wishes to remind departments that unless otherwise stated in the course catalog, pre-requisites must only be passed with a D. Departments should check the online course catalog.

UGC examined the Academic Program Review for Modern Languages, Linguistics and Intercultural Communications. Reviewers for the department noted that the MLLI program is unique in the United States because its curriculum content extends beyond languages. The department does a fabulous job handling general education language requirements. Two items of concern noted in the review are having sufficient faculty to support the MLLI program and the quality and quantity of physical space. The dean and provost are working with the department to alleviate these issues. UGC fully supports this effort and voted to approve the APR.

There was no Steering Committee report. The next meeting of the committee is Friday, April 12th.

This completed the committee reports. Due to time constraints the senate moved to address item B under “Other Reports.” This is a recommendation from the Academic Standards Executive Committee, Office of Undergraduate Education concerning the Residency Policy. Current policy requires that the final thirty credits toward a degree must be taken at UMBC. The proposed policy would require that all students complete at least thirty credits of course work at UMBC to receive a UMBC degree. Amanda Knapp, Academic Standards and Policy Specialist from the Office of Undergraduate Education presented the report. Ms. Knapp was asked for the rationale of the proposed change. She explained that the revised policy would better align with MHEC and institutional goals associated with graduate rates and degree completion by creating greater flexibility for students and removing some of the barriers in time to graduation. It is often difficult to tell when the final thirty credits begin, particularly because students often have to take some credits elsewhere to complete the requirements. The change would simplify the
process of identifying courses that comply with residency requirements during graduation reviews. Seniors engaged in a discussion of the potential ramifications of this policy change. Terrance Worchesky, Chair of UGC, noted that the Undergraduate Council fully supported the change in policy. Their belief was that departments should individually take up the question of whether or not they should require a certain percentage of courses or specific courses within the major be taken at UMBC. Ms. Knapp noted that, in theory, a student could come to UMBC and graduate with a degree in a major without ever having taken a course in that major at UMBC. After several additional comments about the proposed change, senators voted to approve this recommendation.

The remaining presentations were tabled for a later meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.