

Minutes: Faculty Assembly

AGENDA

Meeting called to order at 11:06, a.m. **Tuesday February 21, 2012**

1. Approval of the minutes of the last Meeting: **Draft of minutes at the bottom. Ted Mollett moved to approve, Jurgen Schwarz seconded.**

2. **Report on Possible Changes from across the Bay** (including)

- A. Regents proposed changes to Tenure/Promotion policy (and Sabbatical Policy): ***a version appears below the agenda***

This report was from the Regent.

The version has the word “may” – Currently there is no credit for something that “may” lead to publication, or “may” lead to technology transfer.

If this goes through, we won’t have a say, we will have to adjust to this world. Clearly, will get changed at the other end, and what it should mean across campus. Suggest- that chairs and tenured, should think about this expeditiously. How does this work on the time scale? Does it apply to you or not? Sometime in the not too far future, we will need to make a recommendation about what this should mean at UMES.

Bill Chapin will send out an email asking for those who want to work on an ad hoc committee that will work on the wording for inclusion of technology transfer in future Tenure/Promotion and Sabbatical Leave considerations.

- B. Maryland Bill S859 on Collective Bargaining for tenure-track faculty, adjunct faculty, teaching assistants; ***summary below***

It includes tenure track faculty. We might be able to have collective bargaining for all faculty. This affects our sitting in this room. If we reach a point, where there is collective bargaining, the world will divide into two parts. We will be limited in what we can say that will be under “collective bargaining”. We need to be prepared and watching. It is adjunct faculty that does not have the best deal, and graduate assistants that are cheap labor. It is extended to all of us. If and when it goes through, it will affect us.

C. Maryland Bill S239 on how we handle Technology Transfer: **summary below** (other half of technology transfer) There are all sorts of changes in how technology works. If you manage to get federal support- who does your data actually belong to? Does it belong to you or the feds? The public bought it, the public should have access. There is an issue with confidentiality. Should it belong to the researcher or the public or the university if you use state or federal funding? If you don't get federal support for anything, then you don't need to worry about it. If you are paid to teach, currently it belongs to you if you do surveys for data collection. Confidentiality is protected under current law. We need to watch to see what happens.

D. HR3699 (“Research Works Act”): **summary below**

E. Budget Prospects

Budget situation in MD is reasonably awful. We have to have a balanced budget, we have exhausted reserves. We lost \$90,000 from the current year. There is a wish to have COLA increase. No one knows where the \$ will come from. Plan on the things you would like to do, don't commit yourself to doing anything until the \$ actually appear. Some formula funds have come for land grant universities and the dollars seem to be decreasing. We have had Education money and Title III money to act as buffers. We need to learn how to do the best with what we have. 35 of 750 students were admitted to the University that did not need remedial work in math.

There is a push in MD to have 55% of population to have either an AS or a BS/BA. Currently about 44% of the population has a degree. The Maryland University system has made commitments to increase STEM degrees; if we get the resources, we will.

3. On-Campus Challenges/Questions

A. Semester Grade-Point Average computation (It appears that both “Two A’s and two B’s” and “One A, one B and two F’s” both got reported as a 3.5 semester average!

The only thing that goes into the GPA are the courses that they got credit for during the semester.

Charles Williams and Cheryl Holden-Duffy said that there is an error in the catalog- earned and attempted.

People Soft – we are using it as it came to the University. It handles things to benefit the student. We need to look at history of the student. The system is doing what is supposed to do, but we may not like it.

Bill Chapin will solicit by email a committee that will look at the system as it currently stands. Eddie Boyd will chair the committee to look at the situation and will come back by the next meeting with a recommendation. The committee can come back with as wide a recommendation that they choose. The committee may also look at dismissal and probation recommendations. Cheryl Holden said “Please keep in mind the historical impact of recommendations.”

B. Winter, Summer and Overload course payment scale (comparisons with SU) and handling low enrollments during Winter and Summer sessions. Ronnie Holden is not here, item not addressed.

4. Presentation by Lisa Johnson on academic resources available to us.

Marie Billie for Lisa Johnson- can print off and use with classes. You can use your email address for the username and welcome11 for the password. It is "Free" for faculty.

There will be no meeting next month. The next meeting will be in TWO months, which leaves the committees time to get things together.

C. Department Chair Selection methods. – Some departments have multiple people who have the ability to chair, and there are questions about selection of external chairs. Charles Williams can say thank you, need to have a new chair on Monday.

At this point the hiring committees may be primarily of faculty who are in the department elsewhere.

Third committee: Bill Chapin will solicit by email a group to work on wording. Eric May will be chair.

Currently, there are no rules or regulations on soliciting committees for search committees. Drafting rules and regulations on setting up committees- added to third committee suggestions. Appointing authority for chairs is the president and the dean. Marie Billie wanted other chairs on committee because they know the job, and not just the people in the department so that it is not a popularity contest, not necessarily the person who may be able to do the best job.

Agenda item- investigating – if the recommendation is not followed- then we need to know why the recommendation was not followed. Encourage people who are doing writing to consult Marie Billie- because we have written it in a way that we cannot follow.

Motion to adjourn by Mark Williams and seconded.

No announcements.

ONE VERSION OF NEW TENURE AND PROMOTION CHANGES:

Discussion on Faculty Appointment, Rank, and Tenure and Sabbatical Leave Policies – Draft

II-1.00 UNIVERSITY SYSTEM POLICY ON APPOINTMENT, RANK, AND TENURE OF FACULTY

(Approved by the Board of Regents, April 5, 1989; last amended June 20, 2008)

Section II.B.1 now reads:

“The criteria for tenure and promotion in the University of Maryland System are: (1) teaching effectiveness, including student advising; (2) research, scholarship, and, in appropriate areas, creative activities; and (3) relevant service to the community, profession, and institution. The relative weight of these criteria will be determined by the mission of the institution.”

Proposed revision:

“The criteria for tenure and promotion in the University of Maryland System are: (1) teaching effectiveness, including student advising; (2) research, scholarship, and, as appropriate, creative activities or other activities that may result in the generation and application of intellectual property through technology transfer; and (3) relevant service to the community, profession, and institution. The relative weight of these criteria will be determined by the mission of the institution.”

II-2.00 POLICY ON SABBATICAL LEAVE FOR FACULTY

(Approved by the Board of Regents, November 30, 1989)

Current policy reads:

“The President of an institution may grant sabbatical leaves to faculty members. The primary purpose of such leaves is to provide an opportunity for a faculty member to conduct scholarly or creative work in order to increase his or her contribution to the mission of the institution, and to enhance his or her standing in the discipline or profession.”

Proposed revision:

“The President of an institution may grant sabbatical leaves to faculty members. The primary purpose of such leaves is to provide an opportunity for a faculty member to conduct scholarly or creative work, or to engage in activities that may result in the generation and application of intellectual property through technology transfer, in order to increase his or her contribution to the mission of the institution, and to enhance his or her standing in the discipline or profession.”

[SENATE BILL 859](#)

Bill is in the Senate - First Reading Finance

File Code: [State Government - Personnel](#)

Sponsored By:

Senators Raskin, Conway, Dyson, Forehand, Frosh, Garagiola, Jones-Rodwell, Madaleno, Manno, McFadden, Montgomery, Muse, Pinsky, Rosapepe, Stone, and Young

Entitled:

Higher Education - Collective Bargaining - Tenured Faculty, Adjunct Faculty, and Graduate Student Employees

Synopsis:

Providing collective bargaining rights to tenured or tenure-track faculty, adjunct faculty, and graduate students in specified public institutions of higher education; and establishing separate collective bargaining units for tenured or tenure-track faculty, adjunct faculty, and graduate students.

[SENATE BILL 239](#)

Bill is in the Senate - First Reading Finance

File Code: [Economic and Community Development](#)

Crossfiled with: [HOUSE BILL 442](#)

Sponsored By:

The President (By Request - Administration) and Senators Garagiola, King, Madaleno, Manno, McFadden, Peters, Pugh, Robey, and Rosapepe

Entitled:

Economic Development - Maryland Technology Development Corporation - Maryland Innovation Initiative

Synopsis:

Establishing the Maryland Innovation Initiative in the Maryland Technology Development Corporation; authorizing the Initiative to award grants to specified entities under specified circumstances; requiring the Board of Regents of the University System of Maryland to undertake specified high impact economic development activities; etc.

H.R.3699 -- Research Works Act (Introduced in House - IH)

HR 3699 IH

112th CONGRESS
1st Session
H. R. 3699

To ensure the continued publication and integrity of peer-reviewed research works by the private sector.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

December 16, 2011

Mr. ISSA (for himself and Mrs. MALONEY) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform

A BILL

To ensure the continued publication and integrity of peer-reviewed research works by the private sector.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the `Research Works Act'.

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON FEDERAL AGENCY ACTION.

No Federal agency may adopt, implement, maintain, continue, or otherwise engage in any policy, program, or other activity that--

- (1) causes, permits, or authorizes network dissemination of any private-sector research work without the prior consent of the publisher of such work; or
- (2) requires that any actual or prospective author, or the employer of such an actual or prospective author, assent to network dissemination of a private-sector research work.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

- (1) **AUTHOR**- The term `author' means a person who writes a private-sector research work. Such term does not include an officer or employee of the United States Government acting in the regular course of his or her duties.
- (2) **NETWORK DISSEMINATION**- The term `network dissemination' means distributing, making available, or otherwise offering or disseminating a private-sector research work through the Internet or by a closed, limited, or other digital or electronic network or arrangement.

(3) PRIVATE-SECTOR RESEARCH WORK- The term 'private-sector research work' means an article intended to be published in a scholarly or scientific publication, or any version of such an article, that is not a work of the United States Government (as defined in section 101 of title 17, United States Code), describing or interpreting research funded in whole or in part by a Federal agency and to which a commercial or nonprofit publisher has made or has entered into an arrangement to make a value-added contribution, including peer review or editing. Such term does not include progress reports or raw data outputs routinely required to be created for and submitted directly to a funding agency in the course of research.

Faculty Assembly Attendance
Feb 21, 2012

Name	Unit
Donna Satterlee	Human Ecology
Mike Rabel	Physical Therapy
Joseph Beatus	Physical Therapy
Douglas Ruby	Natural Science
Adel Karara	Pharmacy
Gurbax Singh	Natural Science
Theresa Dadson	Library Science
Jeannine Harter-Dennis	Agriculture
Ali Ishaque	Natural Science
Eric May	Natural Science
Jurgen Schwarz	Food Science and Technology
Ted Mollett	Agriculture
Janet L. Mutschler	Physical therapy
Maryam Rahimi	Rehabilitation
Michael Patterson	Education
Victoria Volkis	Natural Science
Eddie Boyd	Math and Computer Sciences
Jeffrey Molavi	Technology
Michel Demanche	Fine Arts
David Alston	Social Sciences
Emim Yilmaz	Technology
Bijan Shapoorian	Technology
Albert Y. Chi	Math and Computer Science
Mark E Williams	Math and Computer Science
Nianhong Chen	Natural Science
Aaron Rababaah	Math and Computer Science
Madhumi Mitra	Natural Science
Linda Trotman	Physical Therapy

Marilyn Buerkle	English
Abhijit Nagchaudhuri	Engineering and Aviation Sciences
Dia-Eldin A Elnaiem	Natural Science
Charles Williams	Academic Affairs
Cheryl Holden-Duffy	Registrar
Robert Johnson, Jr.	Math and Computer Science
Mohammad Ali	Business Management and Accounting
Lombuso S. Khosa	Human Ecology
Emmanuel Onyeozili	Criminal Justice
Joseph Pitulia	Natural Science
Maurice Clark	Agriculture
Kenny Fotouhi	Technology