

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

March 10, 2015

Senators in attendance included Gloria Chuku, Kimberly Moffitt, Phyllis Robinson, Mariajose Castellanos, Joel Liebman, Charles Nicholas, Bill Lord, Nancy Shelton for Pat Scully, Diane Flint, Robin Farabaugh, Kate Drabinski, David Lansing, Dan Ritschel, Zhiyuan Chen, Lynda Aldana, Cedric Herring, Muddappa Gowda, Hal Schreier, Panos Charalambides, Donald Snyder, German Westphal, Airi Yoshioka, Jessica Pfeifer, Carolyn Forestiere, Diane Alonso, Tim Brennan, James Bemby, Mary Stuart, Lynn Watson, Guenet Abraham. President Sarah Shin was also in attendance.

President Shin called the meeting to order. Vice President Pfeifer will serve as timekeeper for today's meeting. The agenda was approved without objection. President Hrabowski's plane was delayed and he will arrive directly from Reagan National Airport at around 4:30 pm to provide his report.

Provost Rous began his report with an update on the budget. The FY16 budget is working its way through the legislature and we do not have additional information about what is happening there. It will be another month and a half to two months before we know more. He reminded senators that the legislature is empowered to cut the governor's proposed budget but not add to it. We are keeping an eye on proceedings in the General Assembly.

On-campus preparations for the anticipated budget cuts for FY16 have begun. We anticipate a cut of about \$3.7 million to our base budget, or state appropriation, as we move into the next financial year. UMBC's total operating budget is around \$400 million. We spend about a million dollars a day and we must have the revenue to match that expenditure. Roughly, a quarter of our revenue comes from auxiliaries, like food services, dormitories, etc. When we build dorm rooms, we are essentially purchasing mortgages, which we pay back with the revenue that comes from our students. Restricted funds, which are limited to supporting grants and research, account for another quarter. We receive about a quarter from tuition revenue and another quarter from the State of Maryland. The 3.7% cut we are anticipating will come from the state appropriation. With the expected cut, we must bear in mind two things as we build the FY16 budget. First, there may be a change in tuition revenue, due either to a tuition increase or changes (up or down) in enrollment. The final factor is mandatory cost increases, which we have to cover before we spend any extra money. The biggest contributors to these costs are fringe benefits, health benefits, retirement, and utilities. These typically rise each year, so we have to find enough additional revenue to cover them before we begin compensating for a cut.

We are just about to move into our budget hearing process in preparation for developing our budget. We have asked all of the deans to present two budget cut scenarios, the first at a 1% level and the other at a 2% level. This is less than the 3.7% because we believe that we will have additional tuition revenue that will allow us to take a bit off the top and not take the entire cut out to the individual campus units. We are also going through our strategic budgeting process with the knowledge that there will be very little new money available next year, once we have dealt with the cuts and mandatory costs. We will consider new budget requests but the amount of money available will be extremely limited. In previous years we have been linking our budget

requests to four strategic priorities, this year we have reduced it to two. These are budget requests related to research infrastructure and requests related to student success. There will be some limited funds available to invest in new initiatives or to stabilization efforts. The latter is when we invest one-time monies that we want to convert to base when we have a program that needs an injection of funds because its budget is not sufficient. Before continuing his report, Provost Rous opened the floor for questions about the budget.

A senator asked if faculty hires come under stabilization or research. Provost Rous responded that faculty hires are separate from the budget process. He works with the President and Vice President for Administration and Finance on the amount allocated for faculty hires and it is separate from the budget. There has been a change that allows deans to request additional faculty positions through the budget process, in addition to the hiring pool that goes into Academic Affairs. In order to do that, the deans may not be able to make a budget request for something else, but this does allow the deans a little more flexibility.

Senator Ritschel asked if this means that the Provost is considering not making any faculty hires next year. Provost Rous indicated that there likely would be fewer new lines for faculty hires next year. He does not know how much will be allocated for new lines, but is sure we will not be able to hire as many new faculty positions as we have in the previous two years. However, we should be able to do replacement positions because we already salaries on those lines. Because we also currently have enrollment pressure, which we convert to base and then allow departments to combine with other funds to possibly additional hire faculty, we can make some forward progress in this area, too.

Provost Rous discussed faculty hiring for this year. We are currently in the search mode and doing 43 searches for full-time instructional faculty. Thirty of those are tenure-track faculty, two full professor and the remainder at the assistant professor level. We are also searching for twelve lecturers and one professor of the practice. Many of these are replacements and many leverage enrollment pressure money to create parts of new lines to which additional new money is added. This is equivalent to a new line because some are partially and some are fully paid. The total amount in additional salary added is three quarters of a million dollars this year. That translates roughly to about ten new lines. There are an additional five lines leveraged by enrollment pressure money. Total start up expended is estimated to be \$4.2 million. This is a larger amount than we have had in recent years. About \$660,000 comes from the deans, about \$1.3 million comes from the departments, and about \$2.1 million comes from the Provost Office. The provost mentioned that included in that \$2.1 million is the amount allocated from the DRIF return for faculty startup. This year, that will be \$1.6 million of the \$2.1 million. The DRIF allocation has gone down from about \$1.8 million as we lost GEST and lost some DRIF revenue. Compared to last year, we had forty-one searches, with thirty-three of them tenure-track, including two full professors, two associate professors, and twenty-nine assistant professors. The searches included seven lecturers and one professor of the practice. The total out of new money allocated to new faculty salary was \$1.2 million that went to between 12.4 new faculty lines. (Roughly speaking, a good estimate is \$100,000 per line, including salary and benefits.) Total startup allocated last year was \$4.9 million. The deans contributed \$550,000. Departments contributed \$1.6 million and \$2.7 million came from the Provost, of which \$1.6 million came from the DRIF. The provost noted that there has been concern that in the past we had to work solely within the DRIF return of about \$1.8 million. With the help of the deans, departments and the Provost Office, we have been able to increase that amount, almost doubling the amount of startup we can do each year.

The increase is necessary to do the number of hires we do on campus. Over the last two years, on average, we have hired about eleven new lines and conducted searches for 30-33 tenure-track lines, many of which are replacement. We also have averaged ten lecturer searches a year as well.

A senator commented on a pie chart, which indicated student credit hours taught by adjuncts, lecturers, and tenure-track faculty and inquired if the “shares” on the chart have stayed roughly the same or changed. Provost Rous responded in the negative and explained that several years ago we decided, as part of our strategic priorities, to try to convert part-time positions to lecturers to increase the number of full-time faculty. We have pursued this strategy, but because our enrollment has increased over that time, we have increased the number of lecturers but have not been able to decrease the numbers of part-time faculty. The senator asked if tenure-track faculty teaching percentage has kept pace with enrollment growth. Provost Rous said no and added that that is why tenure-track faculty hiring has been the highest priority. He noted that as we went through the recession, we fell behind. There were no further questions.

The February 10, 2015 Faculty Senate minutes were approved as distributed.

The next agenda item was the report of the Faculty Senate President. President Shin indicated that she would combine this report with the report of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

The UMBC Child Care Center will open on September 1, 2015. President Shin asked senators to share this news with their colleagues. Pat Scully, the senator from Education will represent the Faculty Senate on the UMBC Childcare Advisory Committee. President Shin thanked Senator Scully for her service.

At the last senate meeting, President Shin presented a report on integrating adjunct faculty in shared governance. UMBC is committed to providing support, recognition, and institutional integration for adjunct faculty members hired to teach on a course-by-course basis. There is a general feeling among adjunct faculty that they have no representation in shared governance and that they often feel disconnected from discussions on campus governance and policy. Most adjuncts do not know what happens in the Faculty Senate or the role that the senate plays in shared governance. President Shin reminded senators that in her earlier report she spoke of the responsibility of faculty senators to represent the concerns of both full-time and adjunct faculty in their departments. She asked senators to reach out to adjunct faculty in their departments to tell them that senators are their representatives and that if they wished to express concerns about an issue relevant to senate business, he or she should consult with the department senator. President Shin has spoken to several senators who did reach out to adjuncts in their departments and they have reported that adjunct faculty were very appreciative of being sought out for their input.

Because it is impractical for President Shin to attempt to reach out to all senators, the Executive Committee suggested that she conduct a brief one-minute, anonymous survey at the Faculty Senate meeting. The Executive Committee would like to know how many senators have reached out to adjunct faculty in their departments. Etoy Hamlin distributed a six-question survey to senators who took a minute to complete it. After completing the surveys, senators passed them back to Mrs. Hamlin.

Senator Ritschel commented on the use of surveys and then asked if his fellow senators truly feel that they are representative of the interests of adjunct faculty. He indicated that his department welcomes and values adjunct faculty, but he feels uneasy about setting himself up as the representative of their interests. There is an inherent conflict of interest because the full-time faculty in his department feel that an increased number of adjunct faculty comes at the expense of tenure-track faculty and, in one way or another, lessens or undermines student success. Also, they feel that adjunct faculty are hired under different contracts with differing terms and conditions of work and asking senators to represent them creates all sorts of contradictions. While he would like to invite them and make them welcome, this is not a body that truly is representative of the interests or concerns of adjunct faculty.

President Shin clarified that when she asked senators to reach out to adjunct faculty in their departments, she was not asking them to do what the administration does, in terms of traditional subjects of bargaining, compensation, contracts, etc. These things are not within the purview of the senate. Senators' role is to represent the concerns of adjunct faculty as it relates to senate business, e.g. instruction, educating our students, etc. She reminded senators that she had told them she would be sitting in on the meeting that AFAC has once each semester with the senior administration. When she attended that meeting, it was very clear there were things the Faculty Senate just cannot do, like negotiating salary and benefits. However, there are certain things, like the creation of a third rank for adjunct faculty, that are within the purview of the senate. This recognition would be for a very small number of faculty on campus. Among adjunct faculty as a group, there is a lot of diversity. Some of them have full-time jobs elsewhere and teach one course here. Others have been with us for many years and teaching at UMBC is their primary source of income. Some teach at other institutions as well. For those who have taught at UMBC for twenty or thirty years, they would like some recognition. As a rule, departmental policies about student learning, curriculum, etc. are developed without consulting adjuncts, even in departments where the number of adjuncts exceeds full-time faculty. President Shin explained that she made the request to senators to reach out rather than take the stance that this is the way things are and the union will handle it because once a union comes in the relationship becomes much more adversarial. Adjunct faculty have not voted for a union, but if they do, it becomes a "them versus us" situation. It is the opinion of the Executive Committee and many of the faculty that she has talked to across campus that adjunct faculty are our partners. We do not really want to think of them as separate, even though as Senator Ritschel pointed out, their contracts are different and their jobs and primary functions are different. President Shin would like the Faculty Senate, as an integral part of shared governance on this campus, to be more inclusive and lend an ear to the concerns of adjunct faculty.

President Shin recognized Vice Provost McDermott who commented that it had been a couple of years since she last presented to the Faculty Senate about the adjunct faculty shared governance structure and offered a future meeting to present this structure again. An Adjunct Faculty Advisory Committee (AFAC) represents adjuncts in issues concerning compensation, benefits, and other terms and conditions of adjunct employment. There are areas outside of AFAC's charge that may be of concern to the senate. Dr. McDermott said that she would be happy to give senators the framework of that structure so that the body could have an informed discussion on this issue. She also offered to give senators a portrait of the 300-400 adjuncts, many of whom are not in the classroom. For example, in Education, a number of our field placement supervisors are

adjuncts and everyone in DPS is as well. President Shin responded that she thought this was a good idea and indicated that the senate will invite Dr. McDermott to a future meeting.

Senator Ritschel elaborated that some of the discomfort in his department is because adjuncts do not participate in department meetings. They are not given a hearing or a voice in department decisions. Then to ask the department senator to represent the adjuncts, somewhat independently, at the senate, creates a conflict between adjuncts and regular faculty members and between the senator and each of the groups. He believes that asking senators to represent a body without a voice in department governance creates an awkward quandary. The question of asking senators to informally consult with adjuncts in the department and then independently decide how to best represent their interests should be thought about more carefully before going forward. President Shin asked if History prohibited adjuncts from attending department meetings to which Senator Ritschel responded in the affirmative, adding that it has never come up in the department. If an adjunct did ask to attend, the answer would be no as it has been for contracted lecturers.

President Shin asked how many senators come from departments where adjuncts are prohibited from attending department meetings. There were several comments indicating that it has not come up in many departments and that adjuncts are simply not invited. A senator spoke up and noted that while they respect and appreciate adjuncts, the issue lies in shared governance. Full-time faculty are here for the long haul and adjuncts have a completely different interest. Although adjuncts are valued and should be included in some things, there has to be a line drawn somewhere.

Senator Stuart expressed strong support for Senator Ritschel's concerns. There is no consensus within her department around the role of voice and vote in the faculty, for adjuncts or lecturers. For her to presume to take a position representing adjuncts without strong support from her faculty would be a mistake. It is not like representing the faculty on many issues where there is an automatic consensus. This is not one of those issues. The second point she made is that we have a lot of adjuncts and the idea of presuming that she could adequately listen and represent the many different perspectives that the adjuncts have, they play many different roles in the department, would be of concern. President Shin asked if there were more adjuncts than full-time faculty in the department. Senator Stuart replied that she did not know, but there were many. She believes that leading them to expect that she could do something to represent their views would be potentially creating unnecessary complications. In her opinion, with all due respect to adjuncts, this is not a simple issue.

President Shin commented that another suggestion is to create a separate adjunct faculty committee as a sub-committee of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Senator Charalambides offered his experience as a department chair. He wanted to be inclusive and invited all department adjuncts to faculty meetings. They expressed their gratitude at being included, but his full-time faculty approached him and asked that he not invite adjuncts. They were not comfortable having the adjunct faculty in the meetings to the point that they would fight to have them excluded. He commented that this is a very difficult situation.

Senator Drabinski commented that as adjunct faculty at other institutions she often felt compelled to attend department meetings, if invited. She was not compensated, but felt that perhaps attendance might result in something better than what she was getting. Not all adjuncts

are excited to participate in service and she is concerned that we would be creating the illusion of something shared but the result would be nothing more than additional labor for adjuncts.

President Shin commented that in her department they have “Adjunct Appreciation Dinners.” She recognized Senator Watson who explained that in her department, adjuncts can ask to attend meetings. The department by-laws also state that faculty can choose to invite adjuncts, students, or anyone else into meetings, meaning that meetings are technically not closed. However, attendance is by invitation of the faculty. Senator Watson agreed with Senator Drabinski’s perspective and added that, as an adjunct in certain small departments, which truly wanted her input on curriculum and other issues, she did participate.

Senator Gowda said that department chairs hire and fire faculty, adding that full-time faculty do not contact with adjunct faculty. Math and Statistics is also re-writing its bylaws and have never considered including adjunct faculty in department meetings. In thirty years, he has never seen a member of the adjunct faculty come to a meeting.

Senator Chuku stated that adjunct faculty do not attend department meetings in Africana Studies. There is no reason why faculty senators should serve as a liaison or advisory person to adjuncts. Faculty senators represent department faculty through department meetings and adjunct faculty do not attend those meetings. She agreed that adjuncts sometimes have concerns that they may not resolve with the chair, especially since the chairs hire and fire them. In that circumstance, with whom do they share their concerns? She believes that this is how the idea of faculty senators listening to and talking with adjunct faculty originated.

President Shin agreed that Senator Chuku made a good point. It could be overwhelming for senators to represent the voices of adjunct faculty, especially in departments with many adjuncts. However, some senators come from large departments and represent many, many full-time faculty. She agreed with Senator Chuku that senators cannot possibly be perfect in their representation of so many varied voices, but believes that the idea of senators making themselves available to listen to adjunct faculty concerns and referring them to the appropriate places when they cannot help is the topic under discussion.

Senator Liebman asked what percentage of adjuncts are long-term as opposed to those hired for short-term. Vice Provost McDermott responded that a small percentage, perhaps about 10% of adjuncts have been at UMBC for twenty years. She reiterated that she would like to provide senators with a breakdown and lay out the policy that identifies what matters should be dealt with and the shared governance structure to provide some parameters for the discussion. President Shin thanked Dr. McDermott and ended further discussion until that meeting.

President Shin moved on to a proposal submitted last month by Tom Beck and the library faculty to amend the Faculty Senate bylaws to allow library faculty to be eligible for officer positions, i.e. president and vice president. Librarians are members of the faculty senate, but are not eligible for officer positions because current Faculty Senate bylaws state that “Any tenured member of the faculty shall be eligible to serve as a Faculty Senate Officer.” This statement disqualifies library faculty from serving as officers of the Faculty Senate because librarians do not have the term “tenure” in their contracts. The proposal is to amend the by-laws to state that Faculty Senate officers may have tenure or permanent status at the level of Librarian III or IV. These are senior librarians. The Executive Committee has discussed the proposal and has presented a motion to the Faculty Senate. Senators received the motion electronically as an

information item this month. President Shin asked them to take it back to their departments for discussion and a vote at the April meeting. There were no questions. Vice President Pfeifer called time. President Shin requested and received ten additional minutes.

At the last meeting, President Shin reported that the Executive Committee has been looking into when faculty submit grades. During that report, she pointed out that while grades are due from faculty within two to three days of final exams at most institutions in the USM, faculty at UMBC have five business days. UMBC currently has the latest deadline for grade submission among USM institutions. Fall grades are due after the holiday break in December. Grades were due on January 5th this year. This creates problems for students who are graduating and applying for jobs and for students taking winter classes that have prerequisites. At the Executive Tea with the Administration, members received a report from the Registrar's office and IRADS on when faculty turned in their grades in 2014. Forty-two percent of faculty submitted their grades by December 23rd, which is the last campus day. Final exams ended on December 17th. From December 24th to the first week in January, significantly fewer faculty submitted grades. Immediately before the deadline on January 5th, there was a spike in submissions. President Shin pointed out three things. First, some faculty may be finished with their grading before Winter Break but do not post grades on PeopleSoft until January 5th because, technically, grades are not due until then. But, from the students' perspective, not being able to get their grades until January 5th can put them in a difficult position when it comes to applying for jobs or knowing what courses they can take next. We serve students better when faculty submit grades early. Unlike in the past, when the Registrar's Office manually posted grades for each faculty member using "bubble sheets," grades are now available to students as soon as instructors submit them on PeopleSoft. One thing that faculty can do is to submit our grades as soon as they are done. Second, in setting an earlier deadline for grades in some of our large intro classes with hundreds of students, we might be able to look into getting final exams administered a little earlier, to give instructors more time to grade their exams. This would require that instructors of large classes work with the Registrar's Office to coordinate final exam dates. Finally, if some classes are so large and grading is so intensive that setting an earlier final exam date is not going to help, we can make a small number of exceptions by allowing submission of those grades after the deadline. Even if we have to make this exception, the vast majority of our students would get their grades earlier, helping them with their planning. After considering these points, the Executive Committee agreed that the provost should form an exploratory study group, comprised of about three administrators and three faculty, to examine grade submission data and final exam administration. Senators will hear more about this in the coming months.

Nancy Shelton (EDUC), attending for Senator Scully asked to comment. She thinks that making a statement that students are better served when grades are submitted earlier is presumptuous. She explained that she has extremely complicated and "writing-heavy" final projects and if she were required to meet an earlier submission date, her students would be poorly served because she would not be able to read them. The reasons that we have extra time should be considered in terms of our pedagogical practices and the content of our courses. Writing-intensive courses should have writing at the end of the course. President Shin responded by noting that when you look at our fall and spring deadlines there is a huge discrepancy. This year, the last day of final exams is December 17th but grades are not due until January 5th, a period of more than two weeks, while in the spring the last day of final exams is May 21st and grades are due on May 27th. Dr. Shelton protested that the holidays and travel time should be taken into consideration.

She recognizes that Christmas is a Christian holiday, not celebrated by everyone, but it does make a difference for those who travel at that time. Senator Charalambides commented that he posts grades to BlackBoard and allows his students time to review them so that differences can be reconciled before he submits the final grades to PeopleSoft. This way, students know their grades before the deadline. Like Dr. Shelton, he is not sure if the statement that submitting grades earlier really serves the students better. President Shin commented that sometimes when students are applying for jobs, they need their transcripts and if grades are not submitted until later, they cannot get them. Senator Farabaugh requested that the committee looking into this issue provide the Faculty Senate with some data as to how students have been disadvantaged by our waiting until after the Christian holiday period. She has had children on the job market during this time and her impression is that hiring decisions tend to wait until after the holidays.

At the tea, Diane Lee reported on eligibility requirements for undergraduate commencement participation. She reported that in Spring 2012, 272 students with a degree deficit of up to 8 credits participated in commencement, and of those 84 (or 31%) never reached degree conferral. In 2013, 313 students walked at commencement and twenty-three percent never completed their degrees. This has obviously created problems for families who thought their children had graduated. This also pulled down UMBC's retention numbers. Effective fall of 2015, undergraduate students must be enrolled to complete all degree requirements by the end of the spring semester to participate in the May commencement ceremony. Similarly, students must be enrolled to complete all degree requirements in the fall semester to participate in the December commencement ceremony. This will help students who are at the end of their programs to finish and get their degrees. The new requirements have been well received at every venue, including the Council of Deans and the Undergraduate Program Directors. President Shin congratulated Dr. Lee and the Academic Standards Committee for working on this policy change.

Lastly, at the tea, Vice Provost McDermott, Autumn Reed, and Provost Rous reported on efforts to increase faculty diversity at UMBC. They provided an overview of institutional faculty initiatives and pointed out the importance of achieving a critical mass for underrepresented minority faculty in certain research areas. Currently UMBC has 412 full-time faculty members. Only seven percent (29) are African American. Given that sixteen percent of our student population is African American, there is clearly a large disparity in the diversity of our student population and our faculty population. The Executive Committee discussed different ways to diversify our faculty. President Shin plans to ask Vice Provost McDermott and Dr. Reed to present their work to the senate at a future meeting so that senators have a further opportunity to discuss this and provide their input. This concluded the combined Faculty Senate President's report and the Executive Committee report. President Shin asked if there were any questions. Senator Snyder asked for clarification of the policy on walking for commencement. There were no further questions.

There was no report from the Academic Planning and Budget (APB) Committee. Their March meeting was canceled due to snow. Likewise, there was no report from the Graduate Council.

Chairman Worchesky gave the UGC report. Senators received copies of the report electronically prior to the meeting. Dr. Worchesky pointed to an item approving the new degrees proposed by the Music Department. These new B.A. degrees will match up with accreditation requirements and better serve the students. Although there is nearly a one-to-one correspondence between the old degree and the new degree and between the requirements in the old degree and the new

degrees, the proposal still has to go off campus for approval. Dr. Worchesky wanted to point out to senators that this is less a new program than a renaming of what the Music Department has been doing. This concluded the UGC report.

Vice President Jessica Pfeifer gave the University Steering Committee report. All of the shared governance senates, excepting the SGA, have approved the plan of organization. The plan will go forward to the next level. SGA expressed concern over the change from 2/3 to 3/5 needed for approvals because allowing things to pass without the approval of two of the five senate bodies was potentially disenfranchising. This issue will likely be revisited next year.

The Graduate Student Association is holding their 37th Annual Graduate Student Research Conference on March 25, 2015. They encourage faculty to attend. More information is on the GSA website. On April 24-26, UMBC is hosting the Southeast Regional Conference of the National Association of Graduate Professional Students. If faculty have graduate students interested in attending, the fee is \$30 to attend. It is not a research conference, but a conference held by an association that represents the interests of graduate students and professional students. Finally, the SGA is asking that faculty not endorse students who are running for office, or use UMBC resources, e.g. email lists, in order to support candidates. They feel this gives some students an unfair advantage.

Dean Rutledge added that this year the Graduate Research Conference has been revamped in format so that instead of just having presentations from students, there will also be a professional development conference going on concurrently. During all of the sessions, students will have an opportunity to attend either research presentations or the professional development activities. There are also sessions for emerging research. Traditionally, people who had nearly completed their research presented at this conference and those who were in the early stages of their research did not have an opportunity to do so. This year, the emerging research forum will give students an opportunity to gain experience with presenting and provide them with feedback on their presentations. There will be no judging this year but faculty are still needed as reviewers to provide feedback. President Shin added that this is another service opportunity and while she understood that faculty's time was precious and limited, she wanted to encourage them to sign up as reviewers.

Other Reports were next. Tanvi Gadhia, Environmental Sustainability Coordinator, was present with some of her student Eco Ambassadors. Ms. Gadhia introduced herself and the students. As Sustainability Coordinator, she reports to Lynne Schaefer and looks at improving our campus impact on the planet and finding new solutions that break down barriers between us, across campus. The Eco Ambassadors are a team of student volunteers who help to spread the word about how to Go Green, to empower and inspire students and others across campus to understand the broader ecological context of things and what resources are available on campus to save energy, drive less, reduce waste and increase recycling. We have many resources available and have made a bold commitment to carbon neutrality, but found that we were struggling to engage everyone on campus because there was so much going on. Eco Ambassadors are available to come to classes or groups and we have found that peer education is exciting to students. There is a luncheon on Thursday if you want to get your office "Green Certified," which is a quick and easy process. There will be fun recycling trivia and giveaways for faculty and staff. There is also a workshop for any faculty seeking to bring sustainability into their class. It is a very interdisciplinary topic facilitated by Dr. Vita Turner. The Eco Ambassadors introduced

themselves, beginning with Andrew Brow, a senior majoring in mechanical engineering and a France Merrick Sustainability Intern. It is his responsibility to oversee the scheduling of Green Office programs after interested offices have attended the training luncheon. He also schedules Eco Ambassadors to go out to student groups and to develop green promotions initiatives.

DeVaughn J. Jones, a sophomore double majoring in Financial Economics and Computer Science is also a France Merrick Sustainability Intern. He focuses on event coordination, through which he works with departments and student groups on outreach activities and other events. He also coordinates the Eco Ambassadors and facilities program operations. Melissa Udevits is a senior and double major in Environmental Studies and Dance. She believes the Eco Ambassador program is very important because student ambassadors have the opportunity to go out into the larger community and communicate UMBC's commitment to sustainability. The program also gives them the chance to talk with individuals about small actions they can take to be more sustainable. She believes this is particularly important in a university setting where students are establishing behaviors and habits that they will carry with them for the rest of their lives. She also thinks the Eco Ambassador program is important to students like her because it gives them out-of-the-classroom experience collaborating with others. Nailah Henry is a senior and a double major in Media and Communications Studies and Social Work. The Eco Ambassador program is important because it gives students the opportunity to think critically about issues of sustainability and share ideas with your peers. Working with others on sustainability helps to create a sense of community on campus.

Ms. Gadhia concluded the presentation by encouraging senators to invite Eco Ambassadors into their classrooms, groups and offices to help stress this message and the tools and resources we have available to us at UMBC. The website, <http://sustainability.umbc.edu/> is available as a resource to everyone. To contact Ms. Gadhia directly, email sustainability@umbc.edu. There were no questions from senators. President Shin thanked Ms. Gadhia and the Eco Ambassadors for their presentation.

President Hrabowski arrived and provided his report. He spoke to about a thousand high school counselors and said it was amazing the impressions people have of UMBC. He recommended that senators who had not seen a video of the UMBC orchestra take the time to do so. He has had the opportunity to show it to numbers of people who just passed it around. They thought it was the Baltimore Symphony because of the film's look and the sound. It was awe-inspiring when he told people the musicians were students from all over the world and from many different majors and illustrated our international and domestic diversity. People started googling UMBC during the meeting and some even approached him afterwards to ask about the deadline for applying. His point is that as much as we may think people know us, people just do not. In certain parts of the country, people know us and in others, they do not. A favorite question is, "How close are you to The Wire?" When he shows them the new Performing Arts and Humanities Building and where UMBC is in relation to Baltimore, they really do not know. It takes years before people know who you are. They do know that we are not that "Big Ten Place." As we approach our 50th year, we should be documenting as much as we can, not only about faculty achievements but also about the achievements of our alums, in different majors, at different levels. He hopes that senators will help with this effort. Part of the theme of the 50th Anniversary celebration is to find our alums and to bring them back. Our alums are doing all kinds of fascinating things, from theatre and those who are at the Tisch School now, as well as those performing in local theatre,

to music, to teachers and beyond. To those who have not yet experienced our orchestra, he called it breathtaking.

President Hrabowski reported that he is currently spending a lot of his time on the phone and in Annapolis trying to protect our Interdisciplinary Life Sciences building because there are attempts to push us out in the name of something athletic, in another direction. It always comes down to this because there is only so much money and he is determined to make the point that the values in our state should focus first on academics. We will persist in these efforts.

President Hrabowski emphasized the importance of senators reaching out to adjunct faculty and getting their points of view. It has become clear, as he has spoken with adjunct faculty in groups and individually that they, our colleagues, take great pride in being faculty. They teach our students, go to professional meetings and many are scholars. They simply want our respect and appreciation for what they do. We should do whatever we can to communicate with them and show them that respect. They want to be seen as a part of this community, and they are. Senators should return to their departments and within that context, determine the best way to communicating and connecting with adjunct faculty. President Hrabowski commended President Shin for working with the leadership to do just that.

In conclusion, President Hrabowski commented on the budget. He noted that some campuses are already making decisions that focus on cutting and cutting people. Seventy-five to eighty percent of any university budget is people. We are determined not to cut people and so we are being as deliberate and thoughtful as possible about ways of managing our budget so that we support faculty, staff, and students, and that the academic program is at the center of what we do. A part of this has to do with generating revenues in different ways, including attracting students, while recognizing that there are some areas into which we cannot bring new students because we do not have the faculty to support them. There are some areas where we can afford to have more students, both undergraduate and graduate. Specificity in recruiting is important. It means marketing to attract students to certain areas and means analytics, understanding those areas where we should not be allowing students to take courses for which they are not prepared. There are areas where we may have students in classes and if we look at the analytics, who succeeds and who does not, we can predict who has the background to make it. Why would we have an additional 150 students in a section when 80% are not going to make it, are not going to get at least a C? If we can predict that from the beginning and know that these students need a prerequisite, first, we should be doing that. Not doing so does not help them and stretches our resources. We will be doing a lot more of this.

Before ending his remarks, President Hrabowski commented on closings for inclement weather. He noted that it is very complicated to know when to close and when not to close campus. It is hard and he would hate to be the one making the decision. It would be easy to be popular and just close every time it starts to snow and the students would be happy. He added that he has spoken to alums who said that they hated it when UMBC did not close but that it was good to know that the rest of the world did not close every time it snowed! We want to make sure we are being as safe as possible for the campus. We do not want people to fall. The last time was a real problem because every official group that we work with said that the temperature was going to go up to 40 degrees. They were wrong and we had to apologize to the campus. But, we can only go by the official sites and they are not perfect. In conversation with student leaders, he has commented that it is sad that through social media everyone is comfortable being really nasty

and mean-spirited. There is a way to disagree, and it is okay to disagree. He asked senators for their help in helping our students to know how to disagree and added that some of the language students used when disagreeing was certainly not UMBC at its best. He will be going to the SGA and other student groups to say that we need to learn to disagree with civility. We can agree to disagree, but there is a way to do that. We are an educational institution. This concluded the President's Report and the floor was opened for questions.

Senator Stuart commented that she thought we should take this as a learning experience and worked to find options for classes that faculty could "pull out of their pockets." Classes could continue as usual but if faculty had concerns, for example, if they were teaching at night, things should be put online that would inform everyone of what had been done. President Hrabowski agreed that it would be good to find ways to be supportive of faculty in thinking about ways to use technology in this effort. Now that we are out of the snow, it would be good to have activities to give people support in this area. Provost Rous interjected to remind everyone that we did this several years ago during "Snowmageddon." Because of the extended closure, we worked with faculty to get some of their course content online. Now would be a good time to go back and review this. President Hrabowski agreed that it would be good to offer opportunities to people to look at ways that they could do that. It takes support. It would take some of the angst out of it for professors who have material to cover but also have to consider the safety issue.

Another senator spoke about civility and students using cell phones, texting, checking email and otherwise multi-tasking during class. She is concerned that forbidding cell phone use and other technologies in the classroom may not be legal. She noted that it is a struggle when students check email, text, and then step out of class to make or receive phone calls. President Hrabowski commented that this is new for all of us. He highly recommends a book he read recently called, Overworked, Overwhelmed. It is about the 168 hours in a week and how many of those hours are committed to the smartphone and everything else. He brought it up because the use of technology in our lives has become increasingly significant and because it is so new, we have not thought through what is appropriate. We were just talking about another group in the intelligence community about how knowledge is used and how we do these things. President Shin said that she just had a conversation with John Fritz (DoIT) about the use of technology by faculty. He has done a lot of research in this area and has some very interesting results. President Shin suggested that she invite Mr. Fritz to a future meeting to share some of his research. President Hrabowski noted that it would be good to get a sense of best practices and what other universities are doing. The question he gets most frequently from the "60 Minutes" piece was how he got away with taking cell phones away from kids in the bridge program in the Meyerhoff. He had not done that and did not realize that they do take cell phones away from students in the bridge program. The students themselves recommended that. The students felt that the only way they would build community among themselves was to take away their cell phones because as long as they had them, they were still in contact with their friends in other places. They would not come inward towards each other because they were still connected to other people. Vice Provost Lee added that they have used that principle in the classes they teach in First Year Seminar. Students create guidelines for the classroom and they are the ones that always say, do not allow cell phone use in the classroom. They monitor one another. It is building on the idea in the Meyerhoff Program about building community in the classroom. President Hrabowski suggested that it is worthy of substantive, serious conversation on campus. If you are in a classroom and you are with your phone, do you really focus, or are you somewhere else? President Shin commented that John

Fritz's results show that it is not always bad. When we think about the "super computers" of the 1960s and 1970s, now we have electronic devices that are much more powerful yet fit in our pockets. These can be used as a learning tool and it is premature to suggest that it is all bad.

President Hrabowski noted that Tony Moreira recently received the highest award in his country and many from UMBC, including Dr. Moreira's graduate students were present when the President of Portugal gave him the Commander of the Order award. Many of Dr. Moreira's graduate students were women from Portugal who were getting Ph.D.s here. Interestingly, Marc Zupan gave one of the examples given to illustrate the relationship between UMBC and the University of Portugal. He explained that when he taught simultaneously between here and Portugal, students doing projects between the two countries were encouraged to use their cell phones, even as they were teaching, to text across the waters to discuss what was happening. It depends on the nature of the class and other situations. Nancy Shelton commented that in K-12, teachers are expected to have cell phones in the classroom so that parents can contact them by cell. Using cell phones to communicate during class has become a reality. There were no other questions for President Hrabowski. He apologized for not bringing any of the sunshine back from New Orleans.

The next order of business was consideration of the Music Department's proposal for five B.A. programs. President Shin noted that Dr. Worchesky had briefly discussed this in his UGC report. Music Department Chair, Michael Richards is present to give senators a brief overview of the proposals and answer any questions senators might have.

Dr. Richards explained that currently Music has one B.A. degree with eight separate concentrations. They recently went through the accreditation procedure with the National Association of Schools of Music. As a condition for accreditation, the association has asked the Music Department to change the title of their degrees. In the State of Maryland, this means that Music has to discontinue its current B.A. and establish five new degrees. The curriculum will be the same and no additional resources are needed. They anticipate that enrollment will remain the same so there is no cost involved. The real reason to take this action is that it will better align UMBC's Music programs with others in the country. There were no questions. Senators were reminded that this is being presented as an information item and they should take the proposals back to their departments for discussion. The senate will vote on these proposals during the meeting in April.

There was no further new business. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted, Lynn Knazik