

University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science

Draft Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes 10 am-12 pm, 6 December, 2017

Attending: S. Chung, D. Nelson, C. Stylinski, M. Castro, J. Cornwell, E. North, H. Bailey, L. Cooper, D. Secor, D. Nemazie, L. Sanford, M. Jackson, B. Clark

Minutes prepared by H. Bailey

1. October 24, 2017 Minutes

These have been posted.

2. CA updates (D. Nemazie)

Great attendance by faculty senate in Annapolis at the last meeting with President Peter Goodwin. UMCES will be going through a strategic planning process, to be completed by end of 2018. Peter envisages the plan to be about 5 pages with some overarching themes. There will also be an implementation plan. Development of plan will engage external firm, but engage Faculty Senate and faculty. Particularly interested in engaging junior faculty in the effort. There may be funding for faculty involvement in the planning process. Want a plan that is about 80% complete by the fall. UMCES-wide summit -2-day meeting in November or early December 2018 - to go through the plan, including external partners, and get some ground-truthing. Suggest including some discussion of the strategic plan (at least 45 mins) at the UMCES faculty convocation.

Elizabeth suggested having early solicitation of different agencies' needs so that we can be responsive to this in developing our strategic plan. Also have ideas come up from the labs in this process. Dave N. said that some labs do have recent strategic plans that we can build in.

MEES used to give a teaching award, but hasn't done it for several years. Suggestion of an UMCES educators award (which would be broader than teaching and include mentorship) and Larry Sanford will be working on what that will look like. Award could be presented by the students at the UMCES graduation ceremony.

3. GFC Report (L. Sandford, A. Griffin)

Larry will forward a summary via email.

4. Discussion, 2018 Convocation theme(s), structure (J. Cornwell, E. North)

Jeff thought that Peter's emphasis on expanding the international component of our research might help focus the convocation on our external contacts and look at our broader collaborations. There was general interest and discussion on developing a broader program that panned local, national, together with international collaborations, but there was strong enthusiasm for a program focused on international collaborations alone. The general topic would be, how does UMCES grow its international footprint in science. This not only relates to developing additional grant support but also how we expand our institutional prestige.

One means to engage this question is to have several faculty exemplars address specific set of questions on how the developed and sustained international collaborations over their careers.

This could involve presentations by UMCES faculty members as examples and the value to our organization. Dave S. suggested that Kristi Moore could develop some media videos on some topical examples of international work by faculty. Peter could also help with his broader (outside?) experience in international collaborations and communication.

Elizabeth thought that these broader collaborations come from specific questions rather than something you specifically try to do. We already do a good job of collaborating across disciplines and oceans. How do we up our game? Could we bring in a skill development person who could talk about the collaborative process and how we could do it more efficiently internationally, inter-disciplinary and across cultures? Ask Peter Goodwin to speak at the convocation and his vision of UMCES. Cat liked the idea of exploring International collaborations and the challenges. Elizabeth would like to include local, national and international communication and collaborations. Mark suggested the international component may be most helpful as we already do more local and regional collaboration.

Dave N. said Mike Roman worked with Booz Allen Hamilton on international collaborations so we could build off that. Could have a survey that would inform what we currently do in terms of international collaborations. Peter has asked Dave N. to look into this anyway and pull the data together.

Dave S. said that he thought international collaborations can provide interesting research opportunities, but often doesn't provide core funding support. Travel funding may be available, but often not student or salary support so there may be constraints.

Jeff is willing to talk to faculty about their international collaborations we can get background information. Lee said these could be recorded and viewed prior to the Convocation. Could have Kristi Moore help with this?

Sook suggested flexibility in CA, such as reduction in indirect costs, may be helpful in facilitating international funding and collaborations. Cat said these discussions could be extended at the Convocation as this is really helpful. Jeff said that international collaborations add benefit in terms of prestige and reputation rather than necessarily bringing in substantial funds. Perhaps we are already doing a lot, but not advertising our international connections enough.

Helen suggested including looking at international funding sources, including foundations, and drawing on experience within UMCES and other institutions (e.g. Duke Nico \$6.5M from Germany), to see how such funding was solicited and relationships developed.

Break-out groups may help to have structured engagement so not just a listening exercise at Convocation. Could have Peter speak on the first day of the Convocation that may help to inform the discussion.

5. USM Shared Governance Survey (D. Secor)

Dave S. will work on a first draft of completing the annual shared governance survey and then elicit input from the faculty senate. Due in February 2018. There will also be staff and student surveys. Chancellor encouraging shared governance and appreciates comments from survey.

6. Faculty Evaluation and Comprehensive Review procedures (D. Secor)

These will not be implemented for the promotion cycle, but will for the annual reviews.

It has been suggested that the 5-year comprehensive review procedure should apply to Research Professors. There also isn't an Emeritus track for Research Professors. Discuss these items at a future meeting.

7. Updates, Junior Faculty Retreat, Performance Guidelines (E. North)

Junior faculty retreat will not include ranks higher than Assistant Professor. Lora Harris helped the junior faculty take over to design the agenda. It is a 1-day meeting with optional evening in March 2018. They will record videos for each other to describe what they can offer in collaboration within UMCES beforehand and think about collaboration opportunities. Bringing in a professional development speaker. About 15 people will attend; Lora Harris has the list. Can introduce strategic plan at the retreat, but agenda rather full to fit into a day unless expanded.

8. National and international science prizes (D. Secor)

We have done well in awards, but haven't previously looked into monetary prizes and Peter Goodwin has suggested some. Please send additional prizes to Dave S. Also, Dave N. said there can be extensive work required by the nominator so suggested having the institution coordinate championing a nomination. Dave N. is also looking into National Academy fellows and how as an institution we can be more competitive.

9. Update, Science Communication Workgroup (E. North)

Update document provided and they are holding a meeting tomorrow.

10. UMCES FRA Award (D. Secor)

Regents Staff Award seems very competitive. Stacy Hutchinson received an Honorable Mention. Planning to have an UMCES Staff award and center-wide staff meeting when award will be presented. Following up on this, we could similarly have an UMCES FRA award. Most likely the recognition would be for a senior FRA (FRA III or above). The Senate liked this idea.

11. GSC Update (B. Clark)

New policy was voted for and implemented that GSC are now full members of the UMCES Administrative Council.

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Senate members will continue to brainstorm and provide input to Convocation leads on developing program on Convocation theme.
2. Senate members and other faculty members should provide list of know national and international award for which we are competitive to D. Secor.
3. Senate members should communicate to their constituent laboratories that faculty should expect to be engaged in strategic planning in the coming year, which is on a tight timeline.
4. D. Secor will communicate Senate's support of an FRA award to J. Frank

5. By next Senate meeting (late January, early February), J. Cornwell, E. North, D. Secor will provide draft Convocation agenda.
6. D. Secor, C. Stylinski, and L. Harris will prepare a draft shared governance survey for senate review prior to the next Senate meeting.
7. If time allows, a broader discussion on Research Professor review procedures and opportunities for promotion to Emeritus rank will be discussed at the next Senate meeting.