

Faculty Senate Meeting September 1, 2017

In attendance: Lora Harris, Jerry Frank, Dave Secor, Amy Griffin, Don Boesch, Jeff Cornwell, Blake Clark, Sook Chung, Dave Nelson, Cat Stylinski,

Submitted by: Lora Harris

1. Meeting began with thank you to Don Boesch and welcome for him to the faculty for the coming year. Updates from Don:
 - a. Bad news - Cut of University budget, not sure how much that means for UMCES. Don trying to make the case that in years when there are increases, these primarily come from tuition that UMCES cannot take advantage of. Bottom line – cuts hopefully less than 1%, could be as much as 2%.
 - b. Advancement efforts: Balcom evaluation exposed some areas for improvement. Especially interaction with labs. New development personnel at many of the labs. Beginning to coordinate amongst these at CA level.
 - c. MEES program: Issues with new curriculum. Challenges with administration of the program. Has asked that UMCES VP of education work to coordinate and move more on this front.
 - d. Contentious policy in State and Region: Want to be well organized in transition on these points. (Conowingo dredging, fisheries/oysters, etc.)
 - e. Federal budget: Congress rejecting some of most dramatic cuts, but reduction in support for climate science and uncertainty in general is troubling.
 - f. Discussion: *How can senate help with MEES issues? Advise during transition.*
 - g. How is transition going: Relatively smoothly, lots of support and coaching ongoing. He has had pre-existing commitments that have prevented some interaction, but move to Maryland is happening. CA is setting up Peter's first month as a lot of "internal UMCES" transition – visits to lab, meetings amongst CA staff, faculty senate meeting. Some meetings in that month (e.g. Bay Cabinet meeting), but more "external engagement" after the first month. *Letter of welcome sent on behalf of senate by Secor to Goodwin.*
 - h. UMCES having a gathering at the CERF meeting (Hopefully Goodwin will go). Wednesday November 8th.
2. Senate turnover (*Secor leads discussion*)
 - a. Lee Cooper election next month
 - b. Asks all to look at their terms
 - c. Dave Secor in last year of 3-year term – next chair from AL or IMET
 - d. Dave can share CBL election procedures
3. Faculty Development updates
 - a. Lora Harris has worked with junior faculty representatives from each of the lab to come to consensus on top two topics for a junior faculty retreat; grant/lab management and pedagogy for an IVN environment. AL representative suggested making space for networking and organizing this around brainstorming of cross-disciplinary research ideas that could be pursued collaboratively. We think this is a great idea. Finding a preferred

month for the retreat has been more challenging. Next steps are to create a proposal for this that can be brought to lab directors and executive council. This includes identifying speakers on professional development, and estimates of costs. Will need support from lab directors for travel costs for their faculty and then some support of speaker/facilitator costs. *Discussion: Cat – emphasized value of networking for junior faculty and facilitating that with team-building exercises. Nemazie – coordinate with orientation for junior faculty, Nov-Dec this year. New cohort includes quite senior folks (AL & HPL).*

- b. Faculty handbook – pulling pieces out of CBL faculty handbook to create common UMCES handbook for all of UMCES. Attempt to construct as additive web-based effort that can be developed over time.
4. Student led diversity initiative: (Blake Clark)
- a. Blake discussed diversity proposal communicated from GSC to GFC and then to Diversity Committee (Russell Hill & Bill Dennison, Lora Harris was also present in initial presentation). Proposal highlights issues of diversity and inclusion that are lacking.
 - b. What can Diversity Committee do: Policy guidelines – having mandatory web-based training; changing language in UMCES documents to be more inclusive for gender identities, update UMCES calendar with potential external training events, update student handbook to bolster language on diversity & inclusion, implicit bias training for MEES committees related to admissions and re-examine GRE scores for admissions.
 - c. Develop a network of “flag mentors” – this is a more difficult task. Have 1-2 faculty members at each lab who are training in Diversity & Inclusion to mentor students on campus. How to incentivize and identify the correct people. *Discussion: does it need to be a faculty member? Non-academic might be better trained.*
 - d. Also more interaction amongst the labs for monthly IVN meetings to help connect students. Could be related to diversity or inclusion, grad student life, mental health, job prospects. Non-science based near-peer mentoring. First meeting scheduled for next week. “MEES DIALOGUES” for all MEES students. Students are enthusiastic about this.
 - e. *Discussion: Lora: Flag mentor idea raises a challenging issue. This type of service is not currently recognized, requires training and specialized people and advising skills. It would not work well as a rotating position, not all faculty will be well suited to this. Current kudos don’t reward this kind of in depth commitment. So, solutions? Should we think of this as an ombudsman? Would such a liaison and specialized mentor find this work recognized if it was done with 1 month salary, given that shifts in emphasis of research/service/teaching unlikely to fully compensate for this type of work. What about bigger VP of education staff, or a contracted counselor who could hold open hours on a periodic basis at labs where these services are lacking due to remote locations.. Blake mentions there is a proposal on the table at U of M level for Ombudsman role. There is an International Ombudsman Association. Dave: U of M proposal includes shared ombudsman, but then access becomes an issue. Dave: faculty may not be appropriate to serve this role, these are professional skills and training that likely translates to a separate person. Can Dave propose something to executive council for policy discussion on how faculty and UMCES serve students? Nelson: CUSF meeting focus on having these discussions during faculty searches, especially related to implicit bias. UMBC has been very successful, perhaps have faculty chair from UMBC present to us from their perspective*

5. Regents Award
 - a. Mario Tamburri received this last year.
 - b. UMCES faculty successful in research categories, Russell Hill received one for mentoring.
 - c. Process in 2016: Nomination period to all faculty and lab directors requesting nominations. One proposed change would be to add in votes from FRA rep and student rep.
 - d. 2017 timeline: need nomination by September 22. New president may need more time, so more time the better for his office to prepare nomination. This year we may want to consider a single nomination. We will proceed with one nomination, Dave will set up a call soon to discuss nominations in the case that there are close calls in selecting a single nominee.
6. VP of Education Update (Amy Griffin):
 - a. Orientation for new students was successful. Set up relationship between students and VP of Education's office.
 - b. Colloquium agenda is done. Kenny Rose is giving a presentation. Diversity in collaboration will have panel. Students participating well in lightning talks, etc. 39 faculty and 55 students registered.
 - c. GFC has had 2 meetings, one coming up. Review of responsibilities split between office and PCC, especially related to curriculum. Planned tour of labs by Sanford and Griffin to discuss curriculum, learning outcomes. *Can Sanford's office get support to do visits to each of the labs?* Will also solicit feedback on implementation of the curriculum. Griffin is also sitting in on graduate student council meeting to be responsive. Foundation course instructors had a conference call to coordinate. MEES PC committee and GFC committees will be meeting at colloquium. *Discussion: Secor – still disorganized on course offerings. Goal is to coordinate course scheduling through VP of Education office. We need to get ahead of these issues. Committee needs to be approving these courses, not just submitting willy nilly. Nelson also on this committee. Create a clearcut calendar for course submission, etc. Sanford's office will help with 2016 cohort of students and chaos surrounding assignment of different curriculum to them (AOS vs new curriculum).*
7. New policy from U of M to endorse and encourage open access publications throughout the system:
 - a. Do we want to endorse this?
 - b. Who pays?
 - c. Including costs in our grants, can we create "banks" for this to use after grant expires. What about library resources? Are there equity issues – students have unfair burden.
 - d. *Discussion: General thought that this should be focused on junior faculty as it may enhance their citations. This also comes under communication efforts – opening up science to the public. Generation coming up also using google scholar and preference given to open access. IMET pays for student papers who are senior authors. Could GECs help to support these costs, at least partially? All faculty would like to do this, but policy comes down to dollars.*
8. Elkins Professor
 - a. Rose Jagus successful in this for this year
 - b. Covers a portion of her salary plus some additional research \$.
 - c. This may be another effort to pursue each year.
 - d. Would be good to get Rose to present to us on this.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Organize meeting with Goodwin for Faculty Senate through Lori.
- Blake will go back to students to better clarify and also brainstorm on who and what in regards to flag mentor concept.
- Consider inviting UMBC faculty senate chair to discuss diversity successes at UMBC.
- Faculty senators need to remind our labs that the PCC exists and that these upcoming changes are happening, especially regarding course offerings.
- Secor will report out some ideas on open access to administrative council.
- Elizabeth will look for article that talks about increased citations of open access articles.