Vice President Mary Stuart called the meeting to order. President Kathleen Carroll was not in attendance.

Members present included Kimberly Moffitt, David Rosenbloom, Phyllis Robinson, Mariajose Castellanos, Joel Liebman, Yelena Yesha, Doug Hamby, Lisa Dickson, Mavis Sanders, Robin Farabaugh, Kate Drabinski, Daniel Ritschel, Zhiyuan Chen, Lynda Aldana, Christine Mallinson, Jacob Kogan, Hal Schreier, Liang Zhu, Donald Snyder, Ana Oskoz, Jessica Pfeiffer, Markos Georganopoulos, Carolyn Forestiere, Tim Brennan, Steve Pitts, James Bembry, Lynn Watson, and Kelly Bell. Past President Tim Nohe attending to assist Vice President Stuart.

President Hrabowski began the President’s Report by noting how impressed he was by the strategic planning process and commending Provost Rous. It is important as we work through the language in the vision statement to ascertain that it describes who we want to be as a university and clarifies the difference between civic engagement and civic agency. It is also critical that everyone gets involved because the process will work only if we are inclusive.

There are some great editorial pieces concerning the recent HBI finding. President Hrabowski asked legal counsel, David Gleason, to provide a brief overview. Mr. Gleason explained that the court found that the state had funded the HBIs well and that there was no restriction of their mission as claimed in the case. The court did find that there was unnecessary program duplication and that the HBIs lacked programs. Both sides were asked to engage in mediation and have agreed. The purpose of mediation is to facilitate discussion between the parties and no outcome is required. There are questions about the mediation. How can the State’s Attorney General’s office represent all institutions? How will the mediation be conducted? Once these and other issues are worked out, mediation will begin. All parties will look to see if it is practical to transfer or merge some programs. If, at the conclusion, there is no agreement the parties will enter the argument and evidence phase again. The final conclusion is likely to be some years away. When the judge issues a ruling, the appeal process will begin. Mr. Gleason reminded senators that this case began in 2006 and noted that the strategy for avoiding program duplication that may hurt HBIs has not worked. He added that UMBC has only forty-three programs and cannot afford to give up any of them.

Dr. Hrabowski finished the President’s report by discussing construction initiatives on campus. He urged senators to visit the PAHB if they haven’t already. It is a beautiful building and everyone feels good about it. The grand opening for Phase II is scheduled for Fall 2014.

The library pond reconstruction is prompted by stormwater management requirements for the PAHB. Dredging of the pond will be done in December and January. Phases 1 and 2 include construction to protect the pond from runoff, invasive species, and other harmful things and to improve water quality and oxygenation. Sustainability is critical. Some trees will be removed but many more will be planted.
We are putting $16 million into this phase of renovations in the Fine Arts building. This should enable UMBC to address a number of major problems with the building. This is a considerable investment and it is important to be certain that people feel good about the proposed improvements.

The redesigned campus gateway work will begin soon. Representative Adrienne Jones once again helped us to obtain the $12 million in funding to re-do the entrance, which will be completed before Fall 2015. The redesign will improve both traffic flow and safety on campus.

The planned Events Center will begin in mid 2015. The building will overlook the lacrosse fields and hopefully will be finished by Fall 2017. We hope to bring commencement back to campus with the construction of this facility.

The design phase for the Interdisciplinary Life Sciences Center will begin in 2015. This will be a $120 million building.

In a final comment, Dr. Hrabowski said that he is working hard to get more per-student funding from the state.

Provost Rous began his report by highlighting several achievements on campus. The Ethics Bowl team has advanced from the Mid-Atlantic Regionals to the Nationals. Members of the team are undergraduates from a number of different majors.

The Addictive Behaviors Special Interest Group (AB-SIG) of the Association selected Dr. Carlo DiClemente, presidential research professor and professor of psychology and internationally recognized expert on addictions, as a recipient of the Lifetime Achievement Award for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies (ABCT).

History Associate Professor and Chair, Marjoleine Kars participated in a panel discussion about the movie, ”Twelve Years a Slave” on the Diane Rehm Show.

We continue to work hard on environmental and sustainability efforts and just completed a $5 million partnership agreement with the Maryland Clean Energy Centers. We can now upgrade our lighting, irrigation controls and on-demand ventilation in lecture halls. This will save us about 7 million kilowatt-hours, which is equivalent to the annual use of 620 households in the United States. This also will save 3 million gallons of water and reduce carbon emissions.

A new bike-sharing program is being piloted on campus. Currently we have 8 bikes that students can borrow.

November 20th is another electronic recycling event. It will be held on Commons Circle from 7:30 a.m. - 1:00 p.m. Please remember to complete the appropriate inventory control forms for UMBC property.

And finally, we have two green roofs on campus and plan to install one on top of the Administration building. The two existing green roofs are on the addition to Patapsco Hall and
the Residential Life Community Center, a gorgeous facility. The roof on Patapsco Hall is dual-purposed as it is used for research.

In closing the Provost commented briefly about the Strategic Planning Process and the Shared Services Centers Initiative. He congratulated all of those working on the Shared Services Centers and noted that both items would be discussed later in the meeting. He added that he would have to leave the meeting early to catch a train to attend a meeting on the Middle States Accreditation, which is coming up soon.

Faculty Senate minutes from October were approved without changes or additions.

Mary Stuart gave the Faculty Senate President’s report for Kathleen. The Open-Door chat scheduled for Wednesday has been cancelled due to President Carroll’s absence.

In Mid-October Kim Leisey and Jennifer Lepus provided information on student health insurance requirements based on the Affordable Care Act and a variety of options available to students who may need to obtain coverage.

Lynne Schaefer and Terry Cook reviewed results from a customer satisfaction survey. Results were generally positive and they obtained useful information on some areas of concern, including costs to students of textbooks. Executive Committee will be looking at some of the options related to textbook costs, including rentals and open access textbooks, to examine both quality and cost aspects, including consideration of net costs when resale is and is not an option.

Concerns with the effects here at UMBC of the government shutdown in October on the Maryland budget, and the importance of communications on this were also discussed.

More recently discussion involved campus engagement with Strategic Planning. President’s Council provided input to the vision elements and focus areas proposed by the Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC). Senate will participate in that discussion later in today’s meeting. We also received an update on the status of the HBCI ruling, which you heard earlier in Freeman’s report to Faculty Senate.

In conclusion, the Maryland Charity Campaign is underway. Please participate, even if a small amount. You may do a lump sum donation or have your donation deducted weekly through payroll. Go to www.mdcharity.org and click on “Donate Now”

Dr. Stuart also provided the Executive Committee report. David Gleason met with Executive Committee on the issue of faculty email under a litigation hold; he is here to discuss this with Faculty Senate today. The Committee is discussing this and the larger issue of email privacy and faculty notification when email may be accessed.

The Executive Committee is also examining issues related to shared governance and adjunct faculty and faculty who may be unrepresented.
Some smoking policy issues have been raised concerning the smoking area near the Fine Arts Building. These have been forwarded to the Smoking Policy Committee and will be brought up at their next meeting, tomorrow, Nov 13. Fritzie Charne-Merriwether, the committee’s contact person, will report back to Dr. Carroll following the meeting.

There have been inquiries on the status of the issue of +/- grading. Tim Topoleski, chair of the ad hoc committee on +/- grading, is having a difficult time getting members of that committee to meet but is trying to arrange a meeting by the end of this month. Please share with your departments that it is important to honor committee commitments so that progress can be made on issues that committees must deal with, such as this.

Bruce Walz provided the APB Committee report next. APB heard an update on the HBI findings and the implications. The committee also discussed and accepted Year-3 Reviews for Gerontology and English. As part of the English Department’s Action Plan, additional resources have been promised. The APB Committee will continue to monitor this. The majority of the APB meeting was focused on a discussion of Strategic Planning.

Dr. Walz was asked about the implications of the HBI ruling and commented that the USM has placed a moratorium on new program submissions to MHEC for at least the fall submission window and we are waiting to hear if this will be extended into the Spring 2014 window. Internal processes will continue during the moratorium. The Faculty Senate voted unanimously to accept the APB report.

Anna Rubin presented the Faculty Affairs Committee report beginning with Motion 1 proposing changes to Faculty Handbook Section 6.6.6.1, to clarify parameters for the UFRC’s review of dossiers. Existing and proposed language was read aloud and Dr. Rubin explained that the point of the proposed changes was to make the language in Section 6.6.6.1 explicit. There was no discussion and the vote to accept the proposed revisions was unanimously FOR.

Proposed language to revise Section 6.3.7.3 was presented as Motion 2 and read aloud to the senators. This language would rescind the UFRC’s right to consult with outside individuals to determine if nationally recognized standards of scholarship and creative activities were applied to a candidate’s P&T review, and require it to rely solely on the Dean, Department Chair and DP&T Committee for this purpose. Without discussion the motion was approved by unanimous vote of the senate. This concluded the report of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Marvin Mandell presented the Graduate Council report. Senators were provided with a copy of the report. Dean Casper was approved for regular membership on the graduate faculty and three faculty were approved for special membership. Ten courses were approved and the Academic Program Review (APR) in Psychology and Year-3 Review in Physics were both approved. Dr. Mandell noted that a common theme in both reviews was a shortage of faculty leading to fewer advanced graduate courses being offered. In Psychology this appears to pose a threat to the Ph.D. program. Senator Pitts concurred and commented that the department is exploring alternatives. This concluded the Graduate Council report.
Terrance Worchesky provided the Undergraduate Council (UGC) report. Senators were provided with a copy of the report. The report listed courses and program changes approved by UGC over the last three meetings. Dr. Worchesky reported that the council has been working to come up with an actual date by which program and course changes must be submitted for catalog changes and fall course offerings. The council has looked at the Registrar’s timeline and then worked back to allow sufficient time for UGC and Faculty Senate review and reporting. Dr. Stuart thanked senators Mavis Sanders and Steve Pitts for attending the University Steering Committee in her stead. Dr. Sanders reported on the Shared Governance Plan of Organization on today’s agenda as an action item. The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Research Council, has submitted a motion to strike the word “including” from the description of membership on the council and substitute the word “and” in its place. This would increase membership on the council by one, to include two members elected from the directors of UMBC research centers and institutes AND one representative selected by the Research Administrators Group (RAG). The Research Council requested this change to allow for the addition of a staff representative. Dr. Sanders moved that the motion be approved. Senator Castellanos seconded the motion and senators voted unanimously to approve.

A senate vote to approve the Shared Governance Plan of Organization was scheduled next. However, the senator from Gender and Women’s Studies raised two issues of concern to her department and the vote was delayed until these issues were addressed. GWST expressed concern that the General Education Committee (GEC) and the Writing Board were not included in the plan. There was no further discussion at that time.

This concluded committee reports. The senate moved next to Other Reports.

David Gleason, legal counsel, reported on Litigation Holds on Emails. Senators were reminded that the Executive Committee is examining the broader issues of email privacy and faculty notification when email is accessed and asked to limit questions for Mr. Gleason to the subject of his report. Other questions and concerns should be emailed to Kathleen Carroll.

Mr. Gleason explained that faculty who receive Litigation Hold Letters are included in evidence gathering for an investigation or lawsuit. Upon receipt of such a letter, the faculty member should not delete email or perform any routine housekeeping tasks associated with their email. Faculty who continue to use Cyrus email will be moved to Google Mail, which has provisions for preserving it. In these cases, faculty should not notice any change or disruption in email and should continue working as normal. Your email will not disappear and you will not have a new email address. Essentially it just sits on another server. Once the email has been preserved, the evidence will be collected. What is collected is usually the result of a negotiation between the plaintiff’s attorneys, the defendant’s attorneys and the witness. If you get personally named, we end up talking with you about what the plaintiff wants. We try to pare down what the plaintiff wants to what is relevant and then do key word searches. Keywords are provided to IT, which will perform the required searches and provide relevant documents and electronic files. At some point the attorneys go through what has been collected and decide what is relevant or is likely to lead to relevant information. That is part of the discovery process. Hopefully this leads to a settlement or dismissal of the case. Mr. Gleason assured senators that litigation hold letters will only go out if the university is being sued or as part of a court-mandated investigation and they
will only be sent to the individual(s) named. For example, if you witness a slip and fall, you are a witness, or if you sat on a DP&T committee and it ends up in federal court as a discrimination case you will get a litigation hold letter. If you, or a colleague, are named in a case of scientific misconduct where the federal government will require sequestration of the evidence, we will come in and make a hard copy and a mirror copy of the hard drive. We have not been involved in many of these cases at UMBC but there are currently four. We are seeing more litigation but it is still relatively low here. Senator Pitts asked if there would be a Litigation Hold Release letter when the case was concluded to which Mr. Gleason replied in the affirmative. He was also asked about our responsibility if, in the course of an investigation, evidence of misconduct unrelated to the case is uncovered and he replied that we do have a responsibility to pursue it. This would be the same for theft or any other thing of a similar nature. Senator Robinson asked about email for those using Google Mail both personally and for business of the university. Persons who intermingle their personal and professional email or use their work computers to send and receive personal email will find that included in what is captured when the hard drive is copied and a mirror image made. Senators expressed some concerns about the way to convey this information to their departments and asked if it could be posted somewhere for faculty access. Senator Kogan was concerned about what he should tell his department and expressed confidence that the information would be better coming from legal counsel than the department senator. Mr. Gleason clarified that faculty only need to be concerned if they get a litigation hold letter. Vice President Stuart asked for an Executive Summary, which could then be added to the minutes for circulation as an information item.

At the conclusion of this discussion, Senators moved on to the report on Strategic Planning. Members of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, in tandem with the Provost, are presenting talking points to various groups on campus in anticipation of the next phase of planning. Bruce Walz, Chair of APB, has agreed to substitute in Kathleen Carroll’s absence. The Provost is primarily present to listen. Senators received electronic copies of the handout in advance of the meeting and were given hard copies of the handout and the “placemat” illustration of the timeline and the process. Next semester the steering committee will lead a campus discussion on the vision statement and establish strategy groups to work on selected focus areas. These groups will work on their focus areas for a year while interacting regularly with the campus community in an effort to involve everyone in the process.

The decision was made to compose possible vision “phrases” rather than create several complete versions of the vision statement for discussion thereby avoiding the possibility of getting bogged down in discussions of grammar rather than content. These phrases and possible focus areas are being discussed in thirty-five different campus groups. Comments from all thirty-five are being recorded and anonymized for presentation to the steering committee by the member who facilitated the discussion in each group. Comments will be identified by the group from which they originated but not by individual.

Dr. Walz began the discussion by noting that there were two goals for the discussion. First, senators would be asked to look at and discuss the vision statement language. Second, they would be asked for input on the possible focus areas. To produce an effective Strategic Plan it must be rooted in our vision for UMBC. That led the committee to do some brainstorming and to seek input from the campus community. Senators were asked to turn to Page 4 and look at the
existing vision statement in bold. We found out from the survey that people were comfortable with the vision statement. Is this what we want? Vision elements envisioned by members of the steering committee were listed on Page 5. These are some of the ideas and thoughts that have come out of the discussion in the steering committee. Dr. Walz posed the following three questions to be considered:

1. How well do the vision language elements speak to what the campus has achieved AND where we are going?
2. Which of these vision elements inspire you?
3. What’s missing from the list?

Starting with the first question, Dr. Walz opened the floor to comments. How do words like integrity, teaching, learning, bold dynamic model, inclusive excellence, etc. speak to what the campus has achieved and where it is going?

Provost Rous explained that the vision elements are meant to form the framework and convey something that the steering committee felt was important. The exact wording probably would not be in the final vision statement. Is anything missing? Senator Hamby commented that collaborative or group research is not mentioned. Senator Watson noted that agency implies one-way outreach and asked why it was chosen over engagement. At a recent professional organization meeting the group discussed both terms and settled on engagement because it implied a two-way engagement as opposed to a one-way outreach implied by agency. Provost Rous responded that it was put in the vision elements as a placeholder and was the subject of a lot of discussion. This is a work in progress and we appreciate input on that. Senator Pitts noted that societal beneficence through community outreach and involvement is part of the current vision statement and should be retained. Senator Watson added that engagement is used, particularly in the arts community, rather than agency, which connotes something, like a point of view, that is being imposed rather than something that flows both ways. There is a reaching out to the community but also something is returned.

Dr. Walz asked how we use the vision statement to be a vision. Is it too much of what we are or what we have already achieved? Perhaps there’s other wording that would be better? Should it be more attuned to where we are going and what we want to be? Senator Castellanos agreed that if we like where we are, we will likely like where we are going and that the vision statement should include some sort of guidance. The provost noted that in a vision statement you have to do both, convey who we are and a sense of where we’re going. It is actually rather tricky in a relatively brief vision statement so we struggled a bit with how to do it. The ensuing discussion focused on how we see ourselves as a community and where we want to be. In part this is about UMBC on a national scale, but it is also about UMBC’s role in the Baltimore Community, particularly in the arts and other communities, specifically the underserved in the arts. Drawing attention back to the original questions, Dr. Walz posed another question. What if someone asked, what is UMBC? What words would come to mind? Responses included exciting, up and coming, and innovative. Senators were encouraged to take this back to their departments for discussion and to remind colleagues that there was an open meeting on Monday on the Strategic Plan. Senator Pitts commented that the vision statement can be more guided and specific, and very focused and for lack of a better word, doable, or it can be very broader and, in essence, all
things to all people. Words like reimagining teaching, learning and research are overly broad. Was the goal to be a very large positive, we’re moving forward, or a more specific statement? Dr. Walz responded that we actually have two statements, a vision statement and a mission statement. The mission statement is more detailed and defines our role in the System and the state, but it is the broader vision statement that will guide the strategic planning process. The statement is representative of the campus community as a whole and should reflect our collective vision. Senator Farabaugh asked when the statement speaks of an institution that integrates teaching, learning, research and civic agency, was it talking about everyone, faculty and students, or just faculty? Dr. Walz responded that it’s the whole university; it’s both an internal and an external statement. It is what we see as our vision and what motivates us, but it is also the way we express ourselves and our aspirations to the greater community.

The discussion of agency vs. engagement resumed. Senator Farabaugh noted that if we want to produce students who do things, we are better served by agency. If we want to be a community that listens as well as getting involved, engagement is better. Provost Rous interjected that there are some common threads, questions that keep coming up in these discussions. Where are the students? What about outcomes? Senator Forestiere noted that Senators Farabaugh and Watson are really in agreement. If agency is what we hope to achieve then there is room for both in our vision statement. On a final note, Provost Rous reminded members of the open session on Strategic Plan scheduled for Monday, November 18th. This session is an effort to reach people who are not part of any of the groups having this discussion and if needed, more sessions like this will be scheduled.

Dr. Walz shifted the focus from the vision statement to proposed focus areas. The challenge before the campus now is to narrow down the focus areas to a manageable five to eight that the work groups and sub groups will work on to create the strategic plan. Page 5 has a list of guiding criteria and Pages 6-8 list the suggested focus areas and sub-topics that came out of the steering committee discussion. He asked the group to consider the following four questions:

1. What are your thoughts on focus area topics?
2. What are your thoughts on the suggested scope for the focus areas?
3. What opportunities do you see to combine or align suggested focus areas?
4. What’s missing?

Provost Rous explained that the list is organized by placing possible working titles for focus groups to the left and possible charges to each group to the right. The idea is to focus work groups into specific areas and charges. There has to be a finite number in order to create a strategic plan that can be implemented. Last but not least, critical priorities must be identified and tied to the budget.

Mary Stuart suggested that internationalizing our curriculum is a critical priority for our future. Dr. Walz asked for other suggestions, thoughts, or comments? Senator Ritschel suggested that if we are looking to consolidate these focus areas that Extended Connection & Engagement could be linked with Partnerships but added that this was not easy to discuss off the top of his head.
According to Provost Rous, one thing that is beginning to emerge from some groups in terms of organization is that the first three areas, Model Inclusive Excellence in the Student Experience, Lead Innovation in Curriculum and Pedagogy, and Advanced Research, Scholarship & Creative Activity to the Next Level Throughout the Campus are comprehensive enough to cover most of the other suggested focus areas. The exceptions, Partnerships, Economic Development and Extended Connection and Engagement can easily be combined into a single other focus area. Senators noted that there was nothing related to outcomes, exploring options or student diversity included. In a final comment, the Provost noted that all work groups will be charged with developing an “environmental scan” within the context of their focus area. In closing, Dr. Walz reminded senators that members of the steering committee were available for their questions and comments. The open meeting next Monday is at noon. Please send comments to Michael Dillon for inclusion into the report.

Ben Lowenthal and Nico Washington provided an update on Shared Services Centers. For the last six months the working groups have been reviewing business processes and looking at how they can be improved. They have looked at four main areas: hiring, payroll, procurement, and accounts payable. While reviewing these processes they have focused on efficiency, standardization and if the processes are scalable. One work group focused on procurement and accounts payable and the other on hiring and payroll. The groups looked at what works and what doesn’t and then separated outcomes and recommendations into Quick Hits, those that can be implemented in three months or less, and Long Term. Mr. Lowenthal reported that there were five main foci of their efforts. These are training, communication, paper reduction, workflow for approvals, and standardization of processes across campus. For example, current hiring process documents are being reviewed to determine if all of the required signatures are necessary. One example of converting paper to e-forms is electronic time sheets, which will be piloted this fall and fully implemented soon after. Improved staff training and the need for process checklists and training guides are also part of this effort. Senators were reminded that there is a survey being circulated and the results will influence priorities in this initiative. There will be a town hall meeting on November 20th in UC312 from 10:00 - 11:00 a.m. to discuss work group recommendations and get feedback from the community.

There will be a Shared Services Centers Advisory Committee with representation from across campus to advise and guide the process and implementation of Shared Services Centers. The next steps are to pilot centers in two units; one academic and one administrative. Units identified for the pilots are the College of Natural and Mathematical Sciences (CNMS) and Academic Affairs. We have blueprints for the build-out of space in the CNMS for the pilot center. The pilot will include the four areas (hiring, payroll, procurement and accounts payable) identified. Service level agreements will be established before the initiative expands beyond the pilot centers.

In response to a query from Senator Robinson about the impact of the pilot on people in the CNMS, Mr. Lowenthal explained that once a center director was hired, he/she would work with the dean to identify those staff members who will move into the centers. Remaining staff would then be able to focus on the academic mission of the department in support of faculty and students. Senator Brennan commented that the impression faculty have been given is that departments will lose staff to shared services centers and asked if this was going to happen. Mr.
Lowenthal replied that staff would be relocated, not lost. On site visits during the initial phase of this initiative task force members noticed that centralized staff developed expertise that actually improved services. Senator Brennan noted that people support their department, not all departments. If those people are lost to shared services centers it would be problematic. Mr. Lowenthal replied that they are aware of this and that, because we chose not to do a 311 single-center model, staff in the shared services centers would still be part of the department. Senators expressed concern for morale on campus and asked what outcomes were being measured. Nico Washington explained that the community would be involved in developing the metrics as part of the ongoing process. It is important to realize that all units are not the same and look at them on a case-by-case basis instead of across the board. Reporting is not specific because we are not there yet. In response to a final question, Mr. Lowenthal indicated that shared services centers will be accountable to their respective deans and would have the same “dotted line” relationships with other administrative department like HR and Procurement.

In a final report, Donald Snyder briefly provided senators with information on a relatively new initiative, the Faculty Learning Communities program, sponsored by the Faculty Development Center. A faculty learning community (FLC) is a small group of faculty across disciplines that join together in an exploration of specific evidence-based teaching practices. FLCs support faculty in developing a new pedagogical approach, new kinds of assignments, or new ways to assess student learning.

This spring three semester-long FLCs will be launched led by UMBC Faculty Learning Community Facilitators:

1. *Flipped Classroom Pedagogies* led by Sarah Leupen, Department of Biological Sciences

2. *Student Learning Outcomes: What are They and How to Measure Them?* led by Eileen O’Brien, Department of Psychology

3. *21st Century Literacies: Developing and Implementing Digital Assignments* led by Donald Snyder, Department of Media and Communication Studies.

Participating faculty are expected to:

- Attend all meetings
- Attend kick-off retreat in January
- Create and present a product related to the work of the FLC

Participating faculty will receive $500 for professional development. Applications are due on Friday.

There was no Old Business or New Business and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted, Lynn Knazik