



UNIVERSITY of MARYLAND
EASTERN SHORE

Faculty Assembly Minutes

November 19, 2019

Meeting Activity	Responsibility
I. Welcome and Call to Order 11:04	Dr. Bryant Mitchell
II. Approval of the October 15 Minutes	Dr. Bryant Mitchell Chapin 1 st , Williams 2 nd , voted and approved
III. Today's Business	
A. CUSF Update	Dr. William Chapin
B. Proposed change in Meeting dates	Dr. Bryant Mitchell
C. Boyer approach on Promotion and Tenure	Dr. Niemi and Dr. Craven
D. Standing Committees Updates	Committee Chairs 1. Faculty Affairs 2. Academic Standards, Curriculum, Programs, and Service
E. Ad Hoc Committees Updates	Kate Brown
F. New Business	Committee Chairs Eric May
IV. Announcements	Dr. Bryant Mitchell
V. Adjournment	Dr. Bryant Mitchell

Officers:

Chair, Dr. Bryant Mitchell

Chair Elect, Dr. Lombuso Khoza

Secretary, Dr. Donna Satterlee

Treasurer, Dr. William Chapin, CUSF representative

Past Chair, Dr. Mark Williams

Parliamentarian, Mr. Joseph Bree

Minutes:

Dr. William Chapin CUSF report

1. A new chancellor has been selected, Jay Perman, a practicing physician and currently the leader at UM at Baltimore. He is a known quantity to the longer-serving Presidents (and is trusted by them: they have several times chosen him as their leader). He is a good listener and echoes back to those making suggestions to him the words that have said, to confirm that he understands them correctly. He was chosen because the USM needs leadership that can make hard and sometimes unpleasant decisions. When he decides against a suggestion, he generally both reports this and also explains why the final decision came out to be otherwise than the proposer had hoped. [It may be that the changeover of chancellors could take place well before the official July 1 date, to help with continuity. It may be that other matters, like the Presidency at Coppin may already have been decided. Things need to move quickly.]

2. The new Board of Regents is in some sense much more political now. For example, there are now Regents appointed by specific name legislators. Since there are a lot of relatively new Regents (and a fair number of experienced Regents who may not be totally happy with the new arrangements), there is some division and confusion on the BOR exactly at the time they are making decisions about the USM (including us). We must understand that, at the time of the unfortunate events at College Park, our accrediting agency, Middle States, brought the accreditation of College Park into question (something not yet resolved, despite several consequent Middle States' visits to that campus). Middle states determined that, in the athletic situation at College Park, the involvement of the of the USM violated that part of shared Governance that requires that those in power not just listen to the constituencies and then make a decision, but that they then explain why the final decision was not the one that the constituencies had hoped for. This will affect all Middle States accreditation activities on all the USM campuses, including us, for years to come. We will need, perhaps over and over again, to demonstrate that we not only hear our campus constituencies but also give clear explanations of negative decisions.

3. A. The main thing to understand about the coming legislative session is that the overall dollars available are fixed and small. [Several years ago decisions were made that drove payers of large amounts of taxes, both individual and corporate, to leave the state. For example, you do not get much total dollars in taxes from most USM employees, whether they are faculty, staff or administrators.] Since the USM eats up a great deal of the Maryland dollars that are of the type not mandated by state or federal law, any dollars that go for anything else are most likely to be taken from our budget. So, for example, the USM will be negative right now about dollars for the Kirwan Commission's plans to improve pre-college education: any such dollars paid now would almost surely end up coming from our own budget total. There is, however, hope of a 7% overall increase in the USM budget, as has happened in recent years, to keep increases in tuition to a low level. [We need to recognize that these increases are a Maryland thing: Most other states, in our region and nationally, have been cutting academic budgets every year!]

B. Campuses must each have our own "enterprise management and crisis management plan", given the general nastiness of the world and the diversity of the situations of the campuses. Fortunately our President has assured us that this is something that can wait for the beginning of the new calendar year [but please do not refuse to provide your expertise when asked].

C. A great deal has been made of College Park and other central Maryland campuses working actively with the surrounding communities to establish enterprise zones and bring enterprise

dollars: "collaboration to community". We will be challenged to figure good ways of doing this effectively for our world of responsibility, the lower four Shore counties.

4. In all thinking about the new expectation for tenure, promotion, etc., we must realize that the principal thing is keeping students progressing in a timely way to a successful graduation (not just on schedule, but actually possessed of all the tools they will need for a successful life in our rapidly technologically changing and advancing world). We cannot simply get students through the process, but need to *show* that they are really being prepared for the outside world.

Among the problems involved is the recognition across the Bay (and in academia in general) that the current tools for evaluation, like student evaluation of instruction forms, are generally unreliable, highly biased and unfair both to the students using them and to those being evaluated. Some departments, like my own, with many sequential courses, have the good option of evaluating instruction on the basis of *how the students actually perform in the next sequential course*. Again, as Boyer indicates, there can no longer be any one pattern of activities that will cover all faculty members. We are not just "adjusting the weights" for various expectations: campus-wide committees will need to find ways to adjust to perfect diversity. In some doctoral departments, it might well be expected that a faculty member whose skill was in only one from the list i. publishing significant papers, ii. bringing in external dollars, iii communicating difficult concepts to students, iv. being a great recruiter, could spend all her time doing the one thing well and still deserve full credit each toward promotion and tenure and increases in salary. The same will be true for those in departments with a heavy service load: the faculty member who has a special gift for taking unprepared students, undoing the damages of imperfect pre-college education and successfully readying them for STEM careers will be able to get full marks toward tenure, promotion and increases in salary, just doing the one thing.

Push to collaborate with the community. (4 lower counties) We need to be the source of making these enterprise zones. It is a challenge for us, we will have no choice.

The regents are expecting that we will continue to do the right things to keep the students on the right path that will be timely and successful. It is a questions that we are moving people on in way that they can make a living.

Faculty evaluation: will change. Will hear more about Boyer. We don't need to adjust the percentages. Each individual part of the campus needs to do this. It is not reasonable to tell other people that the criteria should match. It must be extremely individual and unique to each department. See the information posted.

Risk management – Dr. Anderson said that we will work on this after the holidays.

Proposed meeting change: Kate Brown made the motion, Dr. Pitula 2nd. Passed. No Nays, no abstentions.

Boyer model of evaluation: Everybody got an article, and a chart that showed the differences.

Dr. Craven: There was information that was sent out. Rhetoric of a more holistic approach, support for looking at a more flexible model. Dr. Simons is on the P&T task force. Practices vary widely. There is movement towards this model. She is requesting volunteers to see what models can fit. We want a fair representation from the schools- want two reps from each school.

Bill Chapin is volunteering.

Dr. Niemi: Jawanda Jackson sent out information. As a professor, Dr. Boyer, of looking at how we look at scholarship, and there are four types of discovery. Scholarship of teaching, Scholarship of Engagement- all of the ways in which we engage our communities- campus, local, state and national. Extension work is an example of

scholarship of Engagement. How do we apply? Scholarship of integration- how do we integrate our various bodies? Several different disciplines, and can we write, study or help the public understand.

There has been extensive research on his work. Look on Google Scholar- Boyer in conjunction with your discipline and see what you can find. Different disciplines have looked into how it works.

Her department adopted the model, and it went to the rest of her university. This model gives a framework to everything that we do. It does not tell us everything we have to do. Not all scholarship has been created equal. There are standards that we need to achieve.

Boyer gives a chance for us to talk about this, beyond what we have done in the lab. The same respect for musicians and STEM scholars. The Boyer model brings a leveling of the work. Dr. Niemi is happy to talk about this at length, and see if it will make a difference here. She is happy to answer questions.

How does this align with promotion and tenure task force? It needs to do that.

Boyer model was revolutionary, and helped cross boundaries. The Boyer book is an easy read, and it is strong path forward. Dr. Sauder met Boyer, and had Dr. Boyer come to her college. Dr. Anderson: she was promoted using the Boyer model. Several schools in Kentucky also adopted the model. The book will be posted.

Standing committee update:

Committee Chairs

1. Faculty Affairs- no info.
2. Academic Standards, Curriculum, Programs, and Service

Kate Brown

This committee has migrated under – caused disruption, some of the constituencies, has come up with the faculty assembly- procedures, reported to the Senate

Delegates are supposed to bring the information back, all of the faculty assembly votes.

Proposed Amendment to Constitution of Faculty Assembly

Standing Committee on Academic Standards, Curriculum, Programs and Services

Proposed:

ii. Committee on Academic Standards, Curriculum, Programs and Services.

The Committee shall review matters and recommend policies pertaining to academic standards, admissions, orientation, curriculum, library affairs, academic facilities, summer school, calendar and catalog schedules, and cultural programs.

1. The Committee shall review all curriculum and program changes and vote on them. A majority vote in favor of the changes will result in recommendations to the full Faculty Assembly. A majority vote of a quorum of the assembled faculty will result in forwarding the recommendations to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for final approval and action.
 - b. Honorary degree and recognition award nominations will originate in the office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs in consultation with the Faculty Assembly.

In the course of our discussion: the committee recommends the following (in green, proposed, II.)

We have a proposed amendment before us. This proposed amendment needs to be published for two weeks. After the two week period, then we can vote.

The committee has representations from undergrads and grads. Didn't see any reason to change the composition of the committee.

Are we willing to have students to involved in curriculum changes? The summary of the changes go to the executive committee. The decisions of how the decisions disseminated? Can the departments look at having student input? The student advisory board in a department could have the chance to have input. We can have the procedures changed. Spend some time thinking.

The students can be part of the committee, should not have a voice in the faculty assembly. It is the faculty assembly.

Student input into curriculum makes sense. This does not preclude others in having input before it comes to the committee.

Is there a separate section in the constitution? (In the senate, about standing committees).

What constitutes a quorum of the faculty assembly? Representation of 50% of the faculty is a quorum.

The alumni might be good to review curriculum that are in the industry.

Some departments have a student advisory board, and they have an alum advisory board.

The curriculum changes is robust. Through departments, then committee, then senate, then to provost office. The decision making the person who began the process are the experts in the curriculum.

The proposal has to be made available has to be available, the committee will come together, make changes, and make it available. Proposed changes, will be emailed. The voting has to be relevant to the December meeting.

If the committee believes there is any changes, they will look at it by Monday, and post.

The changes do not exclude any other items, and they have not been discussed.

If this doesn't make it through the committee, it will not get back to the faculty. In the Senate, nothing was brought to the Senate if it had not been approved.

The goal of getting the curriculum committee – there are members. The membership did not raise these questions.

By the 24th, they will let you know their decision about the working.

Dr. Bryant is recommending that if there is changes that need to happen, get in touch with Dr. Brown.

Dr. Anderson- working on fundraising. They put forward a proposal, a 2 million proposal for the next 5 years. Looking at the state, and the 2 million will be matched, so that there will be a 4 million infusion to the campus.

They will open the capital campaign with this amount.

Dr. May has the flu. He will not be here.

Dr. Johnson- the appeal regarding the lawsuit. There has been buzz. Plead and agitate. 16 letters have gone to the legislators and the like. There is movement on the lawsuit. The governor is around 2 million, and they are wanting around 577. People have written. It is not over yet. We need to apply pressure. Please write letters. We can provide a quality education. We want staffing and resources. Please continue to send letters. Please send sample/template letter.

While we are talking about money, is there an update on Title III money?

Dr. Anderson: They have heard our voice. Senator McConnell (Kentucky) will not let it move to the floor. Are you optimistic? Not pessimistic. Keep pushing. She will let us know if we need to write letters.

Dr. Khoza- International education week: It is all about the students. Encouraging signature study abroad programs. Peace Corps- alumni of Peace Corp will speak.

Thursday will be a carnival around the world until 9:00 pm.

Friday, the tea and treats, in Bailey Thomas room. Thank you. CIE is paying for the Frederick Douglas Fellow.

Dr. Mitchell- sent a document about what is happening in athletics. Students are not getting value for their investments. They will have conversations to see if what they are proposing makes sense.

Joseph Bree motioned to adjourn

Attendance:

Monisha Das	DBM	No
Joseph Pitula	DNS	Yes
Michael Lane	DEML/Honors	No
Dean Cooledge	DEML	No
Lily Tsai	CJ	Yes
Lombuso S. Khoza	CIE	No
Nomsa Geleta	Educ	No
Coach Nelson	KINES	No
LaShawn D. Nastvogel	KINES	No
Robert Mock	ADM	No
Alphonso Garretz	EMSC	No
Grace Namwamba	HUEC	No
Rob Johnson	MCS	No
Nancy Niemi	ACAF	No
Mohammad Ali	BMA	
Dr. H. Anderson	Pres	No
Prince Atttoh	ORLD	Yes
Deborah Sauder	DNS	No
Mark Williams	MCS	yes
Kutrzesia Lankford-Purnell Rehab		No
Fred Tejada	Pharmacy	
Kenny Fotouhi	Tech	No
Linda Johnson	DNS	No

Margarita Truith	KINES	No
Sungjae Hwang	KINES	Y
Gabriele Vleshonici-Jones	DEML	No
Brian Dean	Fine Arts	Yes
Leesa Thomas Banes	BMA	No
Willie Brown	ENG & AVISC	Yes
Kamil Alzayady	PA	Yes
LaKeisha Harris	Grad	
TH Baughman	Social Sci	No
David Alston	Soc Sci	no
Tim Gladwell	SPHP	yes
Bill Chapin	MCS	yes
Cynthia Cravens	ENGL	yes
Sharon Brooks	Library	No
Kate Brown	DBMA	no
Marshall Stevenson	SESA	no
Tyrone Chase	SS	
Marie-Theresa Oyalowa	Pharm	Yes
Chris Harrington	Fine Arts	No
Bryan Gere	Rehab	yes
Joseph Bree	Library	
Donna Satterlee	HUEC	yes
Bryant Mitchell		