

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes 30 September 2021

In attendance via ZOOM: *Andrew Elmore (Chair), Helen Baily, Mark Cochrane, Victoria Coles, Alex Fries, Bob Hildebrand, Judy O'Neil, Kia Ramarui, Mario Tamburri, Anna Windle, Dave Nemazie, Larry, Sanford, Amy Griffin and Rose Jagus (in place of Al Place).*

Welcome new Chair Andrew Elmore!

Action items:

- Cochrane moved to approve previous minutes. O'Neil seconded. All approved past minutes.
- Elected Vice-Chair: Mario Tamburri (must be tenured faculty); Thanked Victoria Coles outgoing Vice-Chair.
- Elect Secretary: Interim Judy O'Neil (discussion re: tendency of female faculty to have this role); Thanked Sook Chung outgoing secretary. *[Note subsequent email of 10/4/21; Bob Hildebrand volunteered to be secretary as Judy O'Neil already had volunteered to be faculty senate rep for UMCES DEIC Committee.]*

MSCHE Accreditation Visit (Larry Sanford): This up-coming week will be the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) Evaluation Team "Reaffirmation of accreditation" 3-day virtual visit. First accreditation was in 2016, led by Ed Houde. The re-affirmation comes more quickly after the first accreditation. In future review will be every 8 years, with no mid-term review as in past (i.e. 2029). Report is based on the written UMCES Self-Study document. The purpose is to follow up on the written report, for the accreditation review committee to ask questions and verify evidence for accuracy. Also the Maryland Higher Education Committee (MHEC) will be piggy-backing on the MSCHE review and will be attending the visit to ensure that UMCES is reviewed by the state. Hali Kilborne is the UMCES MHEC representative. All shared governance groups have had their meeting minutes forwarded to the accreditation team.

Action item: Email Larry and Amy to inform them of who can attend Faculty Senate session with the accreditation team time. Note should try and answer the questions they pose, succinctly.

To date, UMCES seems to be on a good path in this process. There are 3 levels of response they can have 1) things we potentially missed and need to provide more info on; 2) Collegial recommendations i.e. suggestions; 3) Official recommendations that must be addressed immediately, before re-accreditation approved. Ideally would like to avoid requirement issues that must be addressed immediately as that would delay accreditation until they are addressed. There will be a final session in which the accreditation lead (Dr. Meg Tivey, WHOI) will present results Oct 6 at 11:00 AM. The committee then has 2 weeks to write up their report; UMCES has 5 days to respond and then the commission (which only meets twice a year) will make a final decision at their next meeting (likely March 2022).

Admin Council report: DEIC and UMCES culture report. (Larry for Dave Nemazie)

Two groups will independently carry out culture assessments:

1) AGU group from University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, will do a cultural climate survey of many geophysical institutions. There will be ~25 online questions and we will be a

pilot project for the group. We will need high reporting rate, and would like to encourage everyone to participate Will occur ~mid Oct to end of month. 2) Kardia Group, from San Diego, are in charge of second survey. They will do listening sessions – (i.e. group discussions with employees), to hear what people have to say about work culture, which will occur ~last week in October. Anonymity is ensured. There was a question about whether we can keep both reports separate in order to have blind comparison. Also, a question about whether some kind of incentive can be provided to get all groups to participate, i.e. not just faculty and students but all FRAs and staff etc.

Covid Update: (Dave Nemazie) UMCES has highest vaccination rate in USM system with more than 98% full vaccination. We have had some break-through CoVID cases of vaccinated folks. So vigilance still needed and need to continue mask use and limited capacity inside. Peter is doing all hands meetings with all labs/units including Sea Grant and IAN.

USM Regents' awards: (Andrew Elmore) Annual award- The Board of Regents Faculty Awards are “*the highest honor presented by the Board of Regents to exemplary faculty members within the University System of Maryland. These awards publicly recognize distinguished performance in 1) Teaching, 2) Scholarship, Research, or Creative Activity, 3) Public Service, 4) Mentoring, and 5) Innovation on the part of faculty members.*” Note that Regents' award is for work over the past 5 years.

UMCES puts forth one candidate from nomination letters. Two UMCES candidates had nomination letters put forth for *Scholarship, Research, or Creative Activity*” category. Xin Zhang (AL) and Ming Li (HPL) nominations were discussed.

Action item: Xin Zhang nomination will go forward as UMCES nominee this year.

Discussion regarding the different categories of award. It was noted that *Scholarship, Research, or Creative Activity* is the most competitive category across the USM system, and that there is also a “collaborative work” between USM campuses that can be applied in any of the categories, that is generally undersubscribed in terms of nominations, which might be a good place for UMCES to be competitive with nominations in the future. It was also noted that due to UMCES’ small size, only one candidate is put forward in any category each year.

Faculty review procedure update: This issue was originally brought up as part of the accreditation process. Purpose is to standardize the process across laboratories, standardize metrics and reduce the workload for all involved (both faculty and directors), as well as to be able to produce data for accreditation. The revised procedure will be a 2-page form, that will be trialed for 2 years, and then re-evaluated. Given that there are people who have different types of appointments, the variability of scope of work and expectations, needs to be incorporated into the review. There will need to be agreement with director on percentage of effort toward teaching, application, etc. that a particular faculty is expected to accomplish. Integration category to be discontinued and 4 categories will be: 1) scholarship; 2) application; 3) education, and 4) service. Need for a guidance document to help the directors and faculty allocate their activities between categories and set goals. Need for directors to discuss reviews across laboratories. It was pointed out that this standardization applies to **annual review process** specifically and not promotion

and tenure review. Suggestion that those who excel above and beyond in annual reviews assessment, should be rewarded in some way with a “university professorship award” of some sort. It was also noted that faculty efforts in diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) should be mentioned across all categories in the annual review process.

FRA report: (Alex Fries) Nothing to report

Graduate student council report: (Anna Windle ad Kia Ramarui) Working on community building activities.

- Held a workshop on DEI. Although 24 students signed up, and only 10 attended, was still a very successful event.
- Working to get standard letters for acceptance, appointment status, stipend etc. Mentor document; creating a statement of mutual expectations, workplace and mentoring expectations.
- Issue has arisen that students at College Park (and likely throughout UM system) are not 12 month appointments, so they pay taxes on summer salary.

Action items: 1) Larry and Anna will put together a 1-page document on what USM and other institutions do in regard to this problem (i.e. federal tax law issue?) and then 2) VP for education and VP for admin and HR should discuss this issue to see if there is a resolution to this problem.

Grants Administration review: (Helen Bailey) CBL continues to have problems with grants management. We need ongoing updates. Temporary solution appears to have someone who is filling in on off hours and weekend work. (Victoria Coles) HPL also asked to have this issue on the agenda. Peter seems to be prioritizing this, but we need an update. The progress appears to most faculty to be going too slowly and we really need follow up, as this is affecting the ability to move forward with larger grants, frustrating funders, and putting faculty in awkward circumstances.

Action item: Andrew Elmore agreed to coordinate with the administration to get an update on this issue for the senate.

UMCES policies for providing scientific services: (Mario Tamburri)

Wondering whether we need to take a look at how decisions are made regarding provision of scientific services. UMCES seems to lack specific policy on who and how we provide services (e.g., analytical, testing, vessel facilities) to outside groups (e.g., academia, agency, private sector). It appears that currently individuals decide on an *ad hoc* and inconsistent basis. Suggestion is to consider this issue a bit more closely as part of our broader UMCES efforts to expand opportunities and funding sources.

Action item: Dave Nemazie will follow up on what policies exist regarding interacting with “private sector”.

Final agenda item: Addendum to policy on review of unit directors: Tabled until next meeting and meeting adjourned.