

Summary of and Supporting Information for the College of Engineering's New Plan of Organization

Christopher Cadou – Aerospace Engineering

Introduction: The College of Engineering's current Plan of Organization (henceforth referred to as 'The Plan') must be modified or replaced to meet the requirements of the University's new Plan of Organization ('Plan of Organization for Shared Governance at the University of Maryland, College Park'). This has been accomplished via a three-step process:

1) Draft: A new Plan and Bylaws were drafted by a sub-committee of the Engineering Council consisting of representatives from all constituencies in the College (Table 1) including PTK faculty. After considerable thought and investigations of practices at peer institutions, the committee concluded that the current Plan should be replaced with a Plan and Bylaws that closely follow those of the University. The idea was to avoid 'reinventing the wheel' and to minimize the difficulty of getting the Plan approved by the University Senate.

2) Revision: The Plan was presented to the Engineering Assembly on 5/11/2016. Feedback from all College constituencies was solicited and incorporated into the draft Plan. The draft Plan was submitted for review and revision to two University Senate subcommittees in late August of 2016 in order to ensure that it meets the standards set forth in the 'Policy on Shared Governance in the University System of Maryland'¹. The Senate sub-committees were the Elections, Representation and Governance (ERG) sub-committee and the Faculty Affairs (FAC) sub-committee). The main issues addressed during the approximately 5 month revision process are summarized in Table 2. A variety of minor issues having to do with organization, identifying conflicting constraints on membership and typographical errors were also corrected. The Plan was approved by ERG on 4/26/2017 contingent upon a few modifications having to do with procedures for choosing Tenure Track and Professional Track representatives to the University Senate. Making these 'minor' modifications exposed other issues that took substantial effort to resolve. The further revised Plan and Bylaws were presented to the Engineering Assembly on 5/11/18. The latter included a weighted voting scheme for 'school-wide referenda' that was intended to ease the administrative burden on Departments by eliminating the need to identify representatives to the Engineering Assembly every year. Some in the audience felt that the 2:1 TT/PTK faculty representation scheme (the scheme used in the University Senate and approved by the committee that drafted the Plan) was unfair to PTK faculty. So, language associated with weighted voting was removed from the Plan. These changes necessitated another review by the ERG committee which could not occur until the beginning of the Fall 2018 semester. During that review, another minor problem was discovered and language was added to 6.6.3 to ensure that faculty from both T/TT and PTK constituencies would participate in future updates to the Plan.

3) Final Approval by ERG: The final version of the revised Plan was submitted on 9/11/2018 and approved on 9/11/2018.

4) Next steps:

1. The Engineering Assembly votes to adopt the Plan using procedures put in place by the current rules with the exception that all professional track faculty will also be able to cast votes. This modification to the current Plan's procedures was developed in consultation with the campus ERG committee is necessary to fulfill the new campus requirement that PTK faculty participate in some

¹ Section I-6.00 of the Bylaws of the University System of Maryland, <http://www.usmd.edu/regents/bylaws/SectionI/I600.html>

way in the adoption process. Approval requires a 3/5 majority of all votes cast. All votes count equally ie. there will be NO weighted voting. In the new Plan, modifications to the Plan are approved via ‘school-wide referendum’ in which all faculty, all staff, and all elected representatives of the undergraduate and graduate student associations participate. The criteria for approval are simple majorities in two of the three main constituencies (faculty, staff, and student).

2. The approved Plan is submitted to the University Senate for approval. At this point we are targeting the November 7 2018 meeting.

3. The new Plan is implemented by holding elections to fill the various positions. Target for the first meeting of the new Engineering Senate is February 2019.

What follows are brief descriptions of some key elements of the Plan and Bylaws, tables summarizing the compositions of the various committees, and some data to help put the Plan in the context of the University Senate.

Engineering Senate: The proposed new Plan replaces the current ‘Engineering Council’ with a smaller representative body called the ‘Engineering Senate’ composed of 44 elected (and voting) representatives – Faculty (Tenure and Professional Track), Undergraduate Students, Graduate Students, and Staff – plus 17 ex-officio (and non-voting) representatives of the College administration, 2 representatives from the student government association (one undergraduate and one graduate), and the past Chair of the Engineering Senate. The composition of the Engineering Senate is summarized in Table 3. The apportionment of faculty representatives to the Engineering Senate among the Departments is summarized in Table 4 and follows the same formula used to allocate representatives to the Engineering Council in the current Plan.

The term of a Senator is three years.

Engineering Assembly: A school-wide meeting that is held at least once per semester for the purpose of explaining issues currently before the senate, issues facing the college as a whole, and for soliciting feedback from the engineering community. This meeting serves as one of the Senate’s meetings and is open to all members of the college.

Faculty Advisory Committee: The Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) replaces the current ‘Executive Committee’ and is the only standing committee created explicitly in the Plan. Its principal functions are to administer the Senate, to ensure that the Senate’s committees are populated, and to ensure that the documents describing the policies for appointing and promoting T/TT and PTK faculty are reviewed periodically (see 8.3.7 of the Plan). It has 9 voting members and is led by the Chair of the Engineering Senate. Its composition is summarized in Table 4 and compared to that of the University Senate’s Executive Committee as a point of reference. The objective is to keep this body as small (and thus as nimble) as possible while ensuring that all constituencies are represented appropriately. The result is a compromise between required completeness of representation and size. The voting members of the Faculty Advisory committee constitute about 20% of the voting members of the Engineering Senate. On the University level, the voting members of the Executive Committee comprise only 8% of the Senate now and will become substantially smaller once PTK faculty join the University Senate in the spring. Finally, it should be noted that the campus Plan requires that we have a FAC.

Bylaws: The Bylaws codify details of Senate governance that do not need to be in the Plan of Organization. The goal in drafting the new Plan has been to move as much as possible from the Plan to the Bylaws in order to a) make the Plan as easy to understand as possible and b) to maximize flexibility since the Bylaws may be modified without seeking approval from the University Senate and President. Two other standing

committees are specified in the Bylaws. They are the Diversity and Inclusion Committee and the Nominations and Awards Committee.

T/TT and PTK Policies: The Plan establishes two committees that are responsible for setting and updating the policies for appointing and promoting T/TT and PTK faculty respectively. They are the Engineering Senate Special Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (ESAPT) and the Engineering Senate Special Committee on Appointment and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty (ESAPTK). They are specified as special committees in sections 8.4 and 8.5 respectively of the Plan because they only need to be constituted when the guidelines for T/TT and PTK promotion are revised,. The campus requires that the composition of these committees be specified in the Plan. Note that the ESAPT and ESAPTK committees are distinct from the committees that evaluate promotion cases which are the APT committee for T/TT faculty and the APPTK committee for PTK faculty.

Summary of committees specified in Plan and Bylaws: The committees specified in the Plan and Bylaws along with brief descriptions of their functions are summarized below. The objective in drafting the plan has been to minimize the number of committees to the greatest extent possible.

Standing committees specified in Plan.

1. Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC): Responsible for administering the Senate and constituting new committees as needed. 9 voting and 3 non-voting members. Consists of elected Senators and members of Administration. Required by campus Plan.

Standing committees specified in Bylaws

2. Diversity and Inclusion (DI) Committee: Oversees matters relating to the diversity of the College's faculty, staff, and students. Composition specified in Bylaws.
3. Nominations and Awards Committee (NAC): Responsible for creating slates of candidates to serve as Senate Chair and Chair-elect, soliciting and evaluating nominations for the annual awards given by the College for Teaching, Research, and Service. Composition specified in Bylaws.

Special committees specified in Plan

4. Engineering Senate Special Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (ESAPT): Responsible for reviewing and updating policies associated with the appointment, promotion, and tenure of T/TT faculty. These policies are codified in the document titled 'A. James Clark School of Engineering APT Policy'. Required by the campus Plan.
5. Engineering Senate Special Committee on Appointment and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty (ESAPTK): Responsible for reviewing and updating policies associated with the appointment and promotion of PTK faculty. These policies are codified in the document titled 'Policy on Appointment and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty'. Required by campus Plan.

Revising the Plan of Organization. University Policy requires that the Plan be reviewed no less frequently than every 10 years. This is accomplished by forming a committee with representatives from all constituencies that reviews the Plan and suggests changes. The revised Plan is presented to the Faculty Advisory Committee for review and approval. The revised Plan is adopted via a school-wide referendum (6.3.6 and 6.2.1). All faculty (T/TT and PTK), staff, and elected officers of the undergraduate and graduate student associations are eligible to vote in school-wide referenda (see section 9 of the Bylaws).

Table 1 Members of the Plan of Organization Revision Subcommittee

Plan of Organization Subcommittee Roster		
Name	e-mail	Dept
David Bigio	dbigio@umd.edu	ME
Leslie Borak	lborak@umd.edu	Asst. Dean External Relations Ex Officio
Christopher Cadou	cadou@umd.edu	AE, Keystone
Qingbin Cui	cui@umd.edu	CEE
James Duncan	duncan@umd.edu	ME
Jin-Oh Hahn	jhahn12@umd.edu	ME
Elizabeth Lathrop	lathrop@umd.edu	ISR
Pamela Morse	pmorse@umd.edu	Asst. Dean Engr. Communications. Ex Officio
Brian Phillips	bphilli@umd.edu	CEE
Peter Sunderland	pbs@umd.edu	FPE, Keystone
Eric Wachsman	ewach@umd.edu	MSE
Michael Wiederoder	mwiedero@umd.edu	Grad, BioE
isaak mayergoyz	isaak@umd.edu	EE
Peter Kofinas	kofinas@umd.edu	BioE/Assoc. Dean Ex Officio, Keystone
Gottlieb Ohrlein	ohrlein@umd.edu	MSE
James Hazelrig	hazelrig@gmail.com	Grad, AE

Table 2 Summary of substantive changes requested by ERG and FAC.

	Requested Change
1	The 'Executive Committee' should be re-named the 'Faculty Advisory Committee'.
2	Avoid grouping constituencies together for the purposes of representation. This means that separate representatives must be provided for exempt staff, non-exempt staff, undergraduate students, and graduate students on the Faculty Advisory Committee and other committees as appropriate.
3	Establish clear timelines and procedures for the review of Department Plans and ensure that the reviewing body/bodies include elected members from each constituency.
4	Add a 'clear statement of the School's commitment to diversity' to the Preamble.
5	Remove the prefix 'full time' on T/TT and PTK faculty constituencies. The ERG committee was concerned that this would not adequately represent T/TT and PTK faculty with less than 100% appointments.
6	Specify meeting frequencies for all bodies.
7	The compositions of the bodies making tenure (T/TT) or promotion (PTK) decisions must be specified in the Plan.
8	Procedures for electing PTK representatives to the University Senate must be specified in the Plan
9	Procedures for approving Plans must eliminate the unlikely possibility that a Plan revision committee did not have T/TT or PTK representation.

Table 3 Composition of the Engineering Senate

Constituency	Total	Voting	Non-Voting	Notes
TT Faculty	21	21		Specified in Bylaws
PTK Faculty	12	12		Specified in Bylaws
UG Students	4	4		1/1000 per campus Plan
Grad Students	2	2		~Fraction in Univ. Senate
Exempt Staff	2	2		~2x Fraction in Univ. Senate
Non-Exempt Staff	2	2		~2x Fraction in Univ. Senate
Single Member Constituencies	1	1		Used to be 'Ad-Hoc'
Dean	1		1	Ex-officio
Center Dirs. + Asst. & Assoc Deans.	8		8	ISR and IREAP only
Department Chairs	8		8	Ex-officio
President of SGA	1		1	Ex-officio
President of Graduate GSG	1		1	Ex-officio
Past Chair of Engineering Senate	1		1	
	64	44	20	

Table 4 Apportionment of Faculty representatives to the Engineering Senate Representation among the Departments.

Department	TT	PTK
Aerospace Engineering	2	1
Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering	2	1
Civil and Environmental Engineering	2	1
Electrical and Computer Engineering	4	2
Fire Protection Engineering	1	1
Fischell Department of Bioengineering	2	1
Material Science and Engineering	2	1
Mechanical Engineering	4	2
Institute for Research in Electronics and Applied Physics (IREAP)	1	1
Institute for Systems Research (ISR)	1	1
Total	21	12

Table 5 Composition of Faculty Advisory Committee

Constituency	Campus	Engineering	Notes (Engineering)
Chair	1	1	
Chair-elect	1	1	
Faculty	7	3	Two T/TT; one PTK
Staff	2	2	One exempt, one non-exempt
Students	2	2	One undergrad, one grad
Pres/Dean and/or reps.	1	1	Non-voting
Parliamentarian	1	1	Non-voting
Executive Secretary	1	1	Non-voting
Past-Chair	1	1	Non-voting
Total	20	13	

Table 6 Composition of Diversity and Inclusion Committee

Constituency	Voting	Non-voting	Notes
TT Faculty	3		1 each Assist, Assoc, Full
PTK faculty	3		1 from each category
Staff	2		1 exempt, 1 non-exempt
Undergraduate student	2		
Graduate student	1		
Diversity Officer		1	Ex-officio
Total	11	1	

Table 7 Composition of Nominations and Awards Committee

Constituency	Voting	Notes
TT Faculty	3	1 each Assist, Assoc, Full
PTK faculty	3	1 from each category
Staff	2	1 exempt, 1 non-exempt
Undergraduate student	2	
Graduate student	1	
Total	11	

Table 8 Composition of ESAPT Committee

Department	TT Faculty	
	Full	Assoc.
Aerospace	1	1
Chemical and Biomolecular	1	1
Civil and Environmental	1	1
Electrical and Computer	1	1
Fire Protection Engineering	1	0
Materials Science	1	1
Mechanical	1	1
Bioengineering	1	1
Total	8	7

Table 9 Composition of ESAPTK Committee. Note that the numbers of PTK faculty will be adjusted every two years as the newly adopted higher PTK ranks become populated. See section 8.7.4 of the Plan for more details.

Track		Notes
T/TT	8	Full Professor (also members of ESAPT)
PTK: Instructional	≥ 2	Highest rank in Instructional category
PTK: Research	≥ 2	Highest rank in Research category
PTK: Specialist	≥ 2	Highest rank in Specialist category
Total	≥ 14	

Useful Data and Sources

Table 10. Size of Campus vs. College Constituencies (full-time, 2017 data).

Constituency	Campus	Engineering
TT Faculty	1,456	226
PTK Faculty	2,026	195
Staff	5,078	331
UG Students	24,729	3,973
Grad Students	6,967	1,534
	40,259	6,042

Table 11. Approximate size of University Senate after PTK faculty are incorporated. The University Senate has about 180 voting members now and will increase when PTK faculty are included. Because minimum numbers of PTK faculty representatives per College are specified, the numbers here represent a lower bound on the eventual size of the University Senate. The 'Notes' column explains how the numbers of representatives for each constituency was determined. For example, there are 1,456 TT faculty on campus. The POO specifies one Senator per 15 faculty so there are 97 TT faculty senators.

Constituency	Number	Notes
TT Faculty	97	1,456/15
PTK Faculty	68	2,026/30
Staff	25	5,078/200
UG Students	25	24,729/100
Grad Students	10	Fixed at 10
	225	

Data on the sizes of the Campus and College constituencies came from the following documents:

College: <https://www.irpa.umd.edu/CampusCounts/CollegeProfiles/ENGR.pdf>

Campus employees: <https://www.irpa.umd.edu/CampusCounts/Employees/soc-employees.pdf>

Campus students: https://www.irpa.umd.edu/CampusCounts/Enrollments/spring_enroll.pdf

Data on the size of the University Senate came by counting the entries in the University Senate roster:

<https://www.senate.umd.edu/senators/current.cfm>