

**October 5, 2007**

**Motion: To accept the graduate application procedure policy as written (see Attachment 3).**

*Passed*

FOR – 16

AGAINST – 1

Abstain - 0

**Attachment #3 10-5-07 Faculty Committee Meeting  
New Procedures for Evaluation of Graduate Students Applications**

The current method of evaluation of applicants for our department is limited. First, not all faculty are involved in the process, only the Graduate Committee and Graduate Director. The process is inefficient as well because the committee often does not have complete information on which faculty are seeking students, in what areas, or what funding is available. In addition, because so few people have to review so many applicants there is the danger of some worthy candidates not being given a sufficient look. We propose to modify the current process as follows. In essence, each faculty will be given a certain number of applicants to review. The Faculty will then meet as a whole to discuss and rank the applicants. The Graduate Director will then implement the rankings and make any modifications that are needed. The role of the Graduate Committee with regards to the actual admission process of individual candidates would be eliminated.

The procedure is as follows.

1. Completed application is assigned to three faculty for review, in the area of interest of the faculty. If a faculty has been recruiting a student that faculty will always be a reviewer. If a student has expressed an interest in working with a faculty member, where possible that faculty will be given the application for review (but keeping in mind a parsimonious distribution of the applications).
2. Faculty will complete their review online using the APRA system as was done last year. Faculty should track down any loose ends and do reasonable due diligence on the application (e.g. calling a candidate's former advisor, or alerting another faculty in the department about a potential student to review the application as well).
3. Reviews should be done as soon an application is complete, but definitely before January 20. This will allow sufficient time for the Department to collate and organize materials for the review meeting.
4. A half- or all-day review meeting will be scheduled near the beginning of the spring term or first week of classes (TBD). At this meeting, summary evaluation scores and supporting material will be available for all faculty on each of the candidates. A discussion of each candidate will be lead by the three reviewers, with input and discussion from all faculty.
5. A ranking of the candidate will be proposed for admission and funding. Teaching assistantship needs will also be assessed in determining possible funding.
6. At the end of the meeting, a final ranking for admission and financial support or all candidates will be produced. The Graduate Director will use this list to determine admission to the program, but the final decision on admission and funding will rest with the Graduate Director.
7. During the semester as offers are accepted or rejected the Graduate Director will use the ranking list to determine how new offers are made. In addition, if faculty have new funds for research assistantships

(e.g. new grants are awarded or an existing student receives a fellowship), they may consult the list of applicants and rankings to find suitable students.

**MOTION: The instructor of any courses with TA should provide the written evaluation to the Associate Chair before the end of the semester. If the TA serves the laboratory instructor or conducts the discussion section independently, the instructor needs to observe the laboratory or the discussion section at least once during the semester.**

*Passed*

Concerns were raised that faculty would evaluate differently and/or be judging the evaluation only on one discussion session. It was noted that this is designed to flag real problems and is not being used to rank the TAs.

**For 15**

**Against 1**

**Abstain 1**

## **November 30, 2007**

**Motion: To accept the sabbatical leave policy as revised**  
[http://www.geog.umd.edu/localweb/howto/newhowto/committees/policies/personnel/faculty\\_sabbatical\\_obligations.pdf](http://www.geog.umd.edu/localweb/howto/newhowto/committees/policies/personnel/faculty_sabbatical_obligations.pdf)

Motion approved:

FOR – 17

AGAINST – 0

ABSTAIN – 1

**MOTION – Put forward 5 top journals to Dean: Nature; Science; Annals of the Association of American Geographers; Proceedings National Academy of Sciences; Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers**

Motion approved:

FOR – 13

AGAINST

**Motion: to accept the following changes to the requirements for formal admission to candidacy:**

[New item between 18 and 19 in current PhD Program description]

Requirements Prior to Formal Admission to Candidacy. After successfully defending their proposal, but before Application for Admission to Candidacy form is filed with the Graduate School:

- The student must submit a poster of his/her research summarizing the dissertation proposal to be installed in Room 1124. Contact Bob Crossgrove if you have questions concerning format or need access to the plotter. The advisor must review the poster.
- The student must provide bio information (including a list of publications) to the front office for posting on the departmental web site. Template for the bio will be provided. Submit to Bob Crossgrove for posting.
- The student must submit an abstract and graphic/photo of his/her research for the Research Brochure and PhD student research section on the web site. (See pp.61 ff., [http://www.geog.umd.edu/research/rsch\\_brochure\\_0508.pdf](http://www.geog.umd.edu/research/rsch_brochure_0508.pdf), e.g.). Submit to Bob Crossgrove for posting.

Motion Approved:

FOR – 17

Against – 0

Abstain -1

**Motion: To accept the following changes to the requirements for continuing in the PhD program.**

[new item 7 in the current MA Program description]

7. Continuing in the PhD Program. Students in the MA program planning to continue on to the PhD program must follow the same procedures as outside applicants.

Motion Approved:

FOR – 17

AGAINST – 0

ABSTAIN – 1

## **March 7, 2008**

The Plan of Organization was modified based on the discussions at the last faculty meeting and at the faculty meeting retreat. Please review document prior to faculty meeting. Modifications are highlighted.

**Motion: To accepted revised Plan of Organization.**

**FOR – 15**

**AGAINST – 0**

**ABSTAIN – 0**

**Plan of Organization was approved and will be posted on departmental website.**

**Motion: To replace the service section of the assessing merit document used by the faculty merit committee with the attached Service Guidelines.**

What's the difference between editorial responsibilities? Is being coeditor of a large journal OK? Yes, generally most journals have a senior editor, but being a junior editor doesn't count as much.

Assistant professors are not supposed to have a heavy responsibility for service, and a heavy load of service can negatively impact P&T. Assistant professors going for P&T need to achieve national recognition, so they need to have some service. There is no differentiation about expectations between different faculty levels under **section C External Scholarly and Academic Activities..**

**REVISED MOTION – Accept document to allow merit committee to review with the caveat that Section C (External Scholarly and Academic Activities) will be adjusted to identify faculty ranking and criteria as shown in other sections. The merit committee will be allowed to use this document for immediate use.**

**FOR – 12**

**AGAINST – 1**

## **ABSTAIN – 1**

The MPS GIS advisory committee met to review the progress of the program and recommended program changes:

**Motion: To Revisions to the current program by:**

- 1. Delete the requirements for a human and physical advanced elective**
- 2. Add a course in distributed/internet GIS**
- 3. Change the Final Project to be 2 semesters and 6 credits. The project will take a phased approach and will be fairly strictly proscribed.**

**FOR – 14**

**AGAINST – 0**

**ABSTAIN – 2**

## **May 9, 2008**

**Motion: To accept the Graduate Handbook with the following friendly amendments.**

- The URL for the graduate school should be on the front page where it is noted that the graduate school rules override departmental rules.**
- On the last page where we stress the need to maintain a certain number of faculty on the committee, we need to reiterate the university rule about all members being present and the mechanism to deal with last minute committee membership changes.**
- This version of the handbook will be version 1.0**
- Section 1.6.3.1 needs to be highlighted to make completely clear that “The examining committee has no authority to change this document or department rules unless decided by the department.”+**

Mike Kearney brought forth the motion and Shunlin Liang seconded it. The vote was:

**FOR – 18**

**AGAINST – 0**

**ABSTAIN – 0**

The motion passed.

## **October 3, 2008**

**MOTION – to incorporate the changes to the Merit Service Criteria guidelines, including the friendly amendments.**

**FOR – 21**

**AGAINST – 0**

**ABSTAIN – 0**

**Motion: To approve the combined five year BS/MPS GIS proposal with addition of another appendix for undergrad**

**FOR – 20**

**AGAINST – 0**

**ABSTAIN – 1**

**MOTION – terminate the GELS program.**

**FOR – 20**

**AGAINST – 0**

**ABSTAIN – 1**

## **December 5, 2008**

**Motion: The Departmental Chair will attend the Faculty Merit Committee meetings as a non-voting member.**

The motion was discussed and voted on. Motion was passed.

**FOR – 13**

**AGAINST – 0**

**ABSTAIN – 2**

**Motion: Research Scientists in the department should have their titles changed to Research Professors. Hence, Assistant Research Scientists will become Assistant Research Professors; Associate Research Scientists will become Associate Research Professors; and Senior Research Scientists will become Senior Research Professors.**

Concern was raised that we needed to be careful how we list Research Professors so that people outside the department would not get the incorrect impression that the department was only focused on remote sensing. It was felt this could impact our ability to hire in the area of HDGC. It was agreed that keeping separate lists in the AAG guide and on the web pages would resolve this concern. Since teaching and participation in graduate student committees is not part of a research faculty member's regular job responsibilities, and is undertaken separately, the title change would not impact research faculty who were only interested in research.

The motion was voted on and passed.

**FOR – 14**

**AGAINST – 0**

**ABSTAIN – 5**

## **January 23, 2009 retreat**

**Motion: The department will not change its current policy with respect to teaching experience required for graduation from the PhD program. The department will take an active approach in providing students with the opportunities to teach.**

M. Geores proposed the motion and C. Justice seconded.

The motion passed: 18 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain

**Motion:**

**1. Amend the sections of the PhD handbook as follows**

**Dissertation proposal defense**

**Place equal emphasis on the component of the dissertation proposal defense that tests background knowledge pertaining to the research topic and the suitability of the research proposal (amend PhD Handbook Sect.1.6.3.) To advance to candidacy the committee will have to sign off on each section (background knowledge and research topic)**

S. Prince proposed the motion and seconded.

The motion passed: 20 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain

**Motion: All PhD students have to take either Geog606 or Geog636 as a requirement.**

S. Goward proposed the motion and E. Kasischke seconded

The motion passed: 20 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain

**May 15, 2009**

**Motion: To approve the changes to the Graduate Student Handbook (v 2.0) for the 2009/2010 cohort.**

Before student arrives, they should be assigned into a track, and assigned an advisor.

**ACTION – Faculty need to discuss incoming students at faculty meeting at end of year to assign track for next year.**

Friendly amendment – no longer than „the equivalent of“ 30 double-spaced pages.

FOR – 16

AGAINST – 0

ABSTAIN – 0

**Motion: To accept the proposed modifications to the graduate learning assessment procedures (to be circulated soon)**

FOR – 16

AGAINST – 0

ABSTAIN – 0

Comments: We’ve failed 2/3 of the time to meet our own criteria. The current system of grading students is not working – would be clearer to change to Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory.

Number 13 – depth, number 12 – breadth – change Numbers 12 and 13 to read the same way and keep the fields relevant .

**Motion: The department will use the Campus on-line evaluation format for departmental evaluations of TAs and Instructors to provide a review of TA performance using a standardized checklist.**

FOR – Unanimous – no motion necessary

AGAINST –

ABSTAIN –

**Motion: Amend Masters program description to read: “Scholarly paper conten**

**and presentation must be appropriate for publication in a scholarly journal (such as the *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* or *Remote Sensing of Environment*.)”**

FOR – 16

AGAINST – 0

ABSTAIN – 0

Comments: remove „content and presentation“ and replace with „organization“

**Motion: Add to Masters and PhD program description, “Style and format of Scholarly Papers, Proposals and Dissertations must follow the Campus Style Manual”. (see <http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/etd/styleguide/index.htm>)**

FOR – 16

AGAINST – 0

ABSTAIN – 0

**Motion: To accept the proposed Geography Department procedure for journal ranking.**

FOR – 14

AGAINST – 0

ABSTAIN – 2

**Motion: Propose creation of departmental Outstanding Scholar – Teacher and Outstanding Staff member based on campus and college criteria for these awards.**

FOR – 16

AGAINST – 0

ABSTAIN – 0

**Motion: Propose creation of an award for outstanding Alumni, based on their contributions to the department and their enhancement of its work through their achievements.**

FOR – 16

AGAINST – 0

ABSTAIN – 0

Comments: Propose Joe Trocino; passed unanimously

## **December 12, 2009**

### **1. Mission and Vision Statement – Kasischke**

**ACTION** – Response from every faculty member should be collected by next faculty meeting so mission and vision statement can be voted on – **Kasischke**

A revised version of the mission and vision statement shall be circulated prior to the faculty committee meeting.

**Motion: To accept the revised version of the mission and vision statement.**



Vision statement is really good. Mission statement is really good, but all material following seemed unnecessary for the rest of the document.

Editorial comment – academic, educational, research – shorten because it seems redundant.

MOTION – delete latter part of the document.

FOR – 15  
AGAINST – 0  
ABSTAIN – 0

MOTION to adopt Mission & Vision statement for department

FOR – 15  
AGAINST – 0  
ABSTAIN – 0

1. MPS GIS Learning Assessment Plan - Ma

Please review the attached Learning Assessment Plan for the MPS GIS program. This plan has been approved by the MPS GIS Advisory Committee.

**Motion: To accept the Learning Assessment Plan for the MPS GIS program as circulated.**

FOR – 15  
AGAINST – 0  
ABSTAIN – 0

**April 30, 2010**

1. Procedures for Adjuncts in Department – Justice  
Please review the attached procedures.

**Motion: To accept the procedures for Adjuncts in the Department document**

For – 16  
Against – 0  
Abstain – 0

- Graduate Committee – Prince

**MOTION: All graduate students will have access to all research labs. Formulate appropriate behavior to avoid disturbance of personnel working in the labs.**

For – 10

Against – 3

Abstain – 5

## **October 22, 2010**

**Motion: That the Faculty Committee approve in principle the replacement of the current comprehensive structure (GEOG600/602) with the Graduate Comprehensive Study Program, a team taught 2 semester course.**

**Motion Passed:**

**For – 19**

**Against – 0**

**Abstain – 1**

### **2. Merit Review procedures – Kasischke**

Our guidelines were slightly out of line from Senate's guidelines. When Merit Pay TF reviewed, only 2% of campus plans were in compliance. University Senate said all plans must be reviewed and submitted during this semester. The plans submitted will be reviewed by next spring semester. Merit review must happen even if there is no merit pay increase.

Faculty took a verbal vote on Eric's draft to send to the College to put through University process, then make changes and have **secret vote** when it comes back.

Faculty discussed feeling that the FARs were disconnected from merit in that service doesn't get evaluated.

**For – 13**

**Against – 0**

**Abstain - 0**