

Minutes from the 29 August 2013 meeting of the UMCES Faculty Senate

Present: Raleigh Hood (Chair); Katia Engelhardt (AL); Matt Fitzpatrick (AL); Lee Cooper (CBL); Dave Secor (CBL); Cindy Palinkas (HPL); Larry Sanford (HPL); Rose Jagus (IMET, via phone); Dave Nemazie (CA, via phone)

Meeting called to order at 10:03am

First item of business was to welcome Raleigh Hood back from his sabbatical. Raleigh thanked Rose Jagus for her service as interim Chair of the Senate; all in attendance concurred and extended thanks as well.

1. Approve minutes from 9 May 2013 Meeting

Minutes were approved. Rose Jagus reminded the Senate about the need for an organizational chart of educational bodies and representation relevant to UMCES and MEES (item 4 in the 9 May minutes). **Action:** Raleigh will contact Ed Houde about this topic, as it is likely to be relevant to the ongoing process to seek accreditation.

2. Student and FRA representation on the Senate

Discussion centered on the need to formalize the relationship between the Senate and students/FRAs, as per the recently revised Senate bylaws. These terms should be for 1 year without any term limits. During the discussion, it became apparent that the Senate website needs to be updated with current by laws, representatives, agendas, minutes, and other relevant documents. **Action:** Raleigh will e-mail the student and FRA representatives at each unit to encourage selection of representatives to the Senate. Cindy will contact Anne Gauzens about the Senate website.

3. Follow-up on UMCES graduate enhancement proposal (distributed via e-mail prior to the meeting)

Raleigh noted that the proposal was discussed at a recent Administrative Council meeting, with no consensus decisions. Dave Nemazie then updated the Senate: the enhancement funds are new funds, with an UMCES match, for new initiatives that come with associated accountability measures. UMCES has identified 3 priority areas: research competitiveness, graduate education, and mission effectiveness. The funds designated for graduate fellowships will be overseen by Ed Houde, who will setup a process for spending decisions. Some funds are also designated for course redesign (tools, lab and/or field components to new and/or existing courses), as well as management and marketing of MEES and UMCES graduate education. Rose reiterated that these funds are for new initiatives and will become more permanent if we can show progress and success of the program. Dave Nemazie agreed and noted that specific performance metrics (i.e., number of graduate students) have already been identified by UMCES leadership. While Rose

mentioned other appropriated metrics (i.e., abstracts, papers), these are not included in the specified metrics. Katia pointed out that the graduate fellowships could serve as a pilot program upon which a future IGERT proposal could be based. Dave Secor noted that he would like to see a formal statement from the Senate about graduate fellowships; all Senators concurred. Lee suggested that the Senate first develop an idea and vision for the fellowships, then draft and endorse a statement to send to Ed Houde and UMCES leadership. Larry suggested that the statement begin with an appreciation for the funds, a hope for their expansion, and the a vision for their use. During the discussion, several Senators noted that the Senate and Ed Houde should be in communication on this issue, given its significance and speed of decision-making. **Action:** Raleigh will ensure that Ed Houde is informed about Senate meetings. Dave Secor will draft a statement for comment by Senators; this statement will then be discussed by faculties at each unit and then forwarded to UMCES leadership.

4. Report on ARR progress (summary from Ed Houde distributed via e-mail prior to the meeting)
The accreditation process is moving along: the ARR has been submitted and visits have been scheduled with the assessment team. They will evaluate the ARR and provide feedback that will be used in a subsequent self-study that leads into a re-review and final decision. Dave Nemazie noted that this process is moving much faster than expected, likely due to our long-standing record of excellent graduate education. He noted the need for positive faculty support during this process, especially during site visits. The mechanics of these visits are unclear but will likely include UMCES leadership, faculty, and students. Raleigh noted that Ed Houde is doing a great job of leading UMCES through this process; all Senators concurred.

5. Update on Administrative Council business (agenda distributed via e-mail prior to the meeting)
Discussion largely focused on the report completed and submitted by the MEES task force. It was also noted that a system-wide MEES curriculum committee is being formed. Questions arose about the accessibility of the task force report to the faculty. Dave Secor noted that the report should be regarded as containing only brainstorming information and that Tom Miller should be consulted as to how best to inform the faculty. Larry noted that task force members could discuss it at faculty meetings at each unit. **Action:** Raleigh will send the report to Senators. He will talk to Tom about its intent and how best to inform the faculty prior to its more general distribution.

6. Discussion on strategies for strengthening shared governance at UMCES
Raleigh noted that the Senate is the vehicle for shared governance at UMCES. To that end, he posed the following questions: how do we (the Senate) represent faculty interests and concerns (facilitated by standing agenda items at each unit's faculty meetings); how well do we communicate these concerns to the administration; and how responsive are our leaders to faculty concerns raised by the Senate. Also, Raleigh posed the question of whether there should be a

more formal relationship between the administration and Senate Chair, according to the Senate bylaws. Discussion by all followed. There were some concerns over the ability to influence the administration. A recent example is the use of the enhancement funds – while the Senate is pleased with the outcome, the Senate was not formally asked to provide input. However, a counter-example is accreditation, about which the Senate has been asked to provide input. Dave Nemazie noted that it depends on the issue and the timing of the decision process. Dave Secor noted that the Laboratory Directors also play a role, but this is not uniform among the units. Several Senators spoke about the synergy between the Senate Chair and the Administrative Council. It was suggested that a report from the Senate be a standing agenda item for the Administrative Council, as well as the Chair sending agendas and executive summaries to the Senators before and after the Administrative Council meetings, as appropriate. **Action:** Raleigh will send these materials to Senators and set-up the standing agenda item.

7. CUSF highlights

CUSF did not meet this summer. However, Rose noted that there is an opening on the MHEC (MD Higher Education Council) advisory council that is shared between UMCES and UMUC. It was noted the potential importance of selecting an UMCES representative, given the ongoing accreditation process. **Action:** Raleigh will bring this issue up at the next Administrative Council meeting.

8. Other business

Faculty Regents Award nominees are due by 1 November. UMCES can have 1 nominee in each of the categories (research, teaching, public service). Rose has previously served on the selection committee and is willing to help put nomination packages together. It was suggested that a faculty committee of previous awardees help with nominations. Discussion ensued about potential nominees. **Action:** Raleigh will contact previous awardees. All Senators are requested to put forward nominations.

Meeting adjourned at 11:36am.