

Departmental Committee Meeting Agenda

Friday 4/29/16

9 am – noon

Attendees: Chris Justice, Vivre Bell, Katie Doyle, Ralph Dubayah, Laixiang Sun, Giovanni Baiocchi, Kathleen Stewart, Elle Lim, Klaus Hubacek, George Hurtt, Julie Silva, Keith Yearwood, Martha Geores, Jack Ma, Tatiana Loboda, Rachel Berndtson, Ron Luna, Rob Sohlberg, Louis Giglio, Jonathan Resop, Kristen Bergery, Byron Marroquin, Yuan Zhou, Sasha Tyukavina, Ben deVries, Kuishuang Feng, Ruibo Han.

- Introductions of new faculty and staff (Justice)
 - Megan Lang has joined the US Fish and Wildlife Service
 - Grant McKenzie will join us in the Fall, as will Leila DeFloriani
 - Julie Silva has been promoted to Associate Professor
 - Eric Kasischke is going on a full time IPA at NASA HQ
 - He will be working for NASA in a program support role and will no longer have faculty duties
 - We are looking to hire a new Financial Research Coordinator, Marc Lennon
 - Liz is still not 100% , but looking to work from home
- Accept previous meeting minutes and approval of agenda
- Recent Developments and Chair's Update (Justice)
 - There are 9 graduate student fellowship awards, and some still pending
 - There will be a party for students on May 19th
 - BSOS Graduate Awards Dinner
 - Jingli Yang and Brian Melchior fellowship students will be there, so we are looking for faculty to attend
 - Merit we have until next Friday to get final paperwork to the College
 - All Merit Committees have met and offered ratings
 - Late submissions, for any reason, will not be considered by the committee
 - If you have a late argument, contact the Chair
 - Seems to be some confusion over the importance of merit submissions – appeals can be made if faculty didn't understand
 - Dept. will make it more clear so that in future people at least summarize their accomplishments for the Merit years in question
 - We will change the terminology to ask people to summarize for excellence

ACTION – create a one-page example (imaginary) to send around to the Dept., so that they everyone is clear on what is expected [Committees]

- Climate Forum will be held in Stamp
 - Everyone is encouraged to register, although it is open to the public
- GEOG Commencement is May 20th
 - We have 420 students and guests attending the 9:30 ceremony

- There will be an awards ceremony and party on the LeFrak patio, or in 2205 if it rains
 - George Hurtt (Dept) and Eric Kasischke (Campus) are marshals
 - There are roughly 100 students walking including 6 PhDs
- Google – we’re getting more comfortable
 - Fernando has created a “cheat sheet,” so talk to Fernando if you’ve any questions
- Renovations update (Bell)
 - We’re making progress in 1158 and it should be ready by May 13th
 - This will be the new seminar/classroom complete with cloth boards instead of bulletin boards, more room for student posters
 - We’re moving the last research group upstairs (Cheng’s group) – we’ll lock down the space by mid-May
- Associate Chair Issues (Dubayah) – no issues
- Lecturer PTK Draft Policy Status (Resop)
 - The initial draft for lecturer appointment and promotion , based on research faculty appointmet and promotion procuedures , is complete – final draft will be sent out soon
- Undergraduate Committee (Loboda)
 - Please accept the general approach, then we can reassess annually
 - This will put much emphasis on the teaching teams to ensure 400 offerings are in line with the proposal. If those classes don’t teach research skills, they could do poorly on the initial assessment period
 - 40 hrs – for PhD students
 - We expect every 400 level class to have some kind of final paper/project/presentation, which will be evaluated moving forward in pre-assessment of future courses
 - 400 level syllabuses should reflect expectations. Only for GEOG-majors. Russell says we shouldn’t even bother assessing ENSP majors (ENSP can do theirs instead).

MOTION: Accept the general approach to assessing the learning outcomes for the Undergraduate Majors within the Department of Geographical Sciences for the 2016-2020 assessment period as detailed in the document below and charge the Undergraduate Committee (open to participation for all faculty and representatives to the faculty) with completing the development of learning outcomes assessment rubrics for 2016-2020 assessment period.

Outcome: PASSED – MAJORITY VOTE, OBSTENTIONS – 1

- Undergraduate Director Academic Issues (Luna)
 - Career Fair – student numbers not as high as they were in fall semester, although we had an increase in company participation
 - Enrollment for summer is already higher than last year (which was an all-time high) – expecting another record-breaking enrollment
 - Issue of faculty meeting with undergrad students in an advisory capacity, but if they don’t want to see faculty, they don’t have to – this should not

be mandatory, although faculty should make themselves available when requested.

- We encourage students to form relationships with T/TT faculty that teach their classes and are their advisors, to include career advice and recommendations, etc.
- Which mechanisms can we emplace to encourage this?
- How do we create a more open accessibility for students/faculty?

ACTION – give this to the Undergrad Committee: how do we implement cultural change in this regard? [Undergraduate Committee]

- Other issue is size of faculty, all of whom are busy, thus very little time for undergrads
- We need to bring incoming staff/faculty up to speed on rules/policy and expectations in the department
 - Mentoring is important

- Graduate Committee (Baiocchi)

- There has been some concern expressed over the size of the committee, but it's basically sufficient
- Graduate retention – how can we better connect with grad students so that they can succeed in the Dept?

ACTION – wireless on the first floor is problematic – lots of complaints about being kicked off, not able to participate in lectures, etc. Have campus come out and test the wireless [Tech Staff]

- Students are still having difficulty scheduling their defenses due to unavailability of faculty
 - Send reminders to read materials for PACs
 - Students should work closely with committee members, and get the committee chair involved if having difficulty scheduling meetings
- FYI – if a grad student needs a laptop, first see your advisor – if needed the advisor can then contact the chair for departmental support
 - McKeldin also has PCs for rent

ACTION – Create infrastructure for borrowing laptops and making such information available/accessible [Computer Task Force]

- Graduate Director Academic Issues (Sun)

- **MOTION:** New changes have been made to the handbook
 - All grad students are required to take 6 courses (16-17 credits) before the teaching training seminar
 - Many RAs want to be TAs
 - Must rotate faculty through these courses: 601 608, 606 or 636 798
- **Outcome: PASSED** – Majority voted – Abstentions - 3

- Research Director Issues (Hurt)

- Research Faculty PTK Policy modifications will include new campus PTK language
- Major changes to PTK promotions will be forthcoming because of the new campus PTK policy. BSOS is forming an additional committee to review PTK cases, which means more service will be expected from GEOG (at the individual level – people to sit on the committee will be required), so be prepared

- Research Faculty Committee (Giglio)
 - Research faculty are basically satisfied regarding service/merit, although soft money expectations are a source of frustration
 - Faculty Specialist Committee (Sohlberg)
 - Committee has submitted two promotion cases for this coming year
 - Everyone submitted a PRD this year
 - Elections will be held to replace Rob Sohlberg as Committee Chair
 - It's been a difficult year for federal grants writing due to fewer grants and more competition
 - Diversity Task Force (Hansen – out sick)
 - Committee has yet to meet this semester
 - Computer Task Force (Hansen/Stewart)
 - Task force hasn't met yet this semester, but the lab renovations are the only topic of discussion thus far
 - A complete renovation of the GIS labs is currently in discussion. One lab at a time will be remodeled and everything will be replaced
 - MPS Advisory Committee Update (Stewart)
 - MPS GIS China – Loh signed an MOU with Nanjing Normal University, so the first cohort will be during the Summer of 2018
 - 56 applications for the MPS program, 19 of which have been accepted thus far (goal for fall is 45 students)
 - Our booth at the AAG conference should have PhD program materials available too, not just MPS program material
 - Many grad students assisted with the booth and made it a success – many thanks!
 - GIS Center Update (Torrens/Ruibo)
 - Paul gave a presentation to the Dean and Provost
 - CGIS is planning to hire an additional lecturer
 - A Fire proposal has been submitted, thus a cohort of high school students in the GIS pipeline will enter as undergrads under Fire money (Kathleen)
 - Additional Business –
 - Scheduling classes during non-standard times (i.e. once per week at “odd” times/75 min duration) is clashing with the final exam schedule
 - It is understood that faculty only want once-per-week courses, but this conflicts with exam schedules and is causing major problems, as the Dept must get the Dean's approval each time – solution?
- Action - Associate Chair to provide guidance on implementation

Upcoming Events

- Maryland Day – April 30th

- Climate Forum, Stamp Student Union – May 4th
- BSOS Scholarship and Donor Recognition Dinner – May 4th
- Newsletter – May 13th deadline
- Geographical Sciences Graduation May 20th at 9:30 am
- Geographical Sciences Awards Ceremony – May 20th, 12:30 pm
- Orientation Week – Tuesday August 23rd – Friday August 26th
- Orientation Social (Klaus Hubacek hosting) August 24th 4:30 pm

Undergraduate Committee Assessment

Motion: Accept the general approach to assessing the learning outcomes for the Undergraduate Majors within the Department of Geographical Sciences for the 2016-2020 assessment period as detailed in the document below and charge the Undergraduate Committee (open to participation for all faculty and representatives to the faculty) with completing the development of learning outcomes assessment rubrics for 2016-2020 assessment period.

Background

In the recent review of BSOS assessments of learning outcomes it became apparent that our previous approach is inconsistent with the University guidelines and needs to be revised substantially. The Undergraduate Committee met with Katherine Russell, the BSOS Associate Dean for Undergraduate Affairs, to discuss potential approaches to developing successful methods for assessing the learning outcomes. During this discussion, the committee agreed that a broader approach to assessing the learning outcomes of the program as a whole (rather than of individual courses as was done previously) would present a more holistic view of the skills our graduates possess upon the completion of the degree requirements.

Learning outcomes for the Bachelor of Science degree in Geographical Sciences (Geography and GIS).

The Department of Geographical sciences expects all students awarded the Bachelor of Science degree in Geography or GIS to possess the basic mastery of the knowledge and skills listed below:

- 1) Geographic theory: **knowledge** and **understanding** of basic facts and fundamental theories across the field of geography as a whole.
- 2) Integrative thinking: ability to **synthesize** material within and between sub-disciplines of geography and global issues
- 3) Research skills: ability to **design** and **implement** a research project, following the general research implementation scheme from identifying the problem to defining the hypothesis or research question, selecting an appropriate geographic method, and implementing the chosen methods competently.
- 4) Communication: ability to **communicate effectively orally, in writing**, and through **geovisualization**.

Assessment implementation methodology

The committee proposes to assess all or one of the learning outcomes, identified above, through a random sample of final course papers or projects across the full range of the 400-level courses offered during a given academic year. To implement this, we propose to hire 1 or 2 hourly PhD students (preferably at the advanced stage of their degree development) for a total of 40 hours to read or attend, in person, the randomly selected set of 100 final class projects/presentations/papers and score each final product for their achievement of the learning outcomes according to rubrics specific to each category of the learning outcomes.

Proposed sample rubric for assessing the learning outcomes for Research Skills:

Metric	Skill mastery level			
	Novice	Developing	Proficient	Advanced
Identify the problem	The problem is neither identified /articulated nor supported by evidence and citations.	The problem is implicit but not articulated. Poorly supported by citations.	The problem is stated and mostly supported by evidence and citations.	The problem is clearly stated and sufficiently supported by evidence and citations
Hypothesis, Research Questions	No Research Questions or Hypotheses are presented.	Research Questions or Hypotheses are present but variables and relationships are poorly articulated.	Research Questions or Hypotheses are present but variables and relationships are not fully supported.	Research Questions or Hypotheses are clearly articulated and relationship and variables are clearly and scientifically identified.
Appropriate method	An inappropriate methods is chosen or none at all.	An ineffective method is chosen.	An appropriate but not ideally suited method is chosen.	The method is ideally suited to the Research Questions or Hypotheses.
Implementation	Incorrect outcome as a result of poor implementation.	Major issues with implementation are evident, potentially affecting the outcome (proper sampling, error-free code, proper validation, etc.)	Some minor issues with implementation are present; however, they do not affect the outcome (proper sampling, error-free code, proper validation, etc.)	An effective “accurate and error-free” implementation is demonstrated (proper sampling, error-free code, proper validation, etc.)

Department of Geographical Sciences
Research Faculty (PTK) Appointment, Evaluation and Promotion (AEP) Policies
Revised April 2016

This document specifies policies and procedures to be used by the Department of Geographical Sciences. It is consistent with, and supplemental to, the University of Maryland Guidelines for Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion of Professional Track Faculty approved by the President on May 4th 2015 (URL listed below)

https://faculty.umd.edu/policies/documents/UM_Guidelines_for_PTK_Appointments.pdf

Specific administration details regarding appointment contracts (IV.A – D) can be found in the UM Guidelines. It is understood that the Department of Geographical Sciences policies may be superseded by any changes in the University policy and the provisions of the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences policy.

1. Definition and criteria for the different Research Faculty ranks.

Post-Doctoral Associate

Individuals holding a doctoral degree but with limited prior research experience, who are hired to support departmental research activities, typically will be initially appointed at the rank of Post-Doctoral Associate. Under this appointment, the individual is expected to execute research project goals as developed and defined by the project principal investigator. The doctoral degree will be a normal requirement for appointment at this rank.

Assistant Research Professor

The Assistant Research Professor rank is generally parallel to Assistant Professor. The candidate shall have demonstrated superior research ability through conducting independent research and publishing in refereed journals, and been a PI or Co-I on one or more awarded research grants. It is also desirable that the candidate has proven qualified and competent to direct the work of others (such as technicians, graduate students, other senior research personnel). There should be clear evidence that the candidate is capable of acting in an independent manner in relation to carrying out research.

Associate Research Professor

The Associate Research Professor rank is generally parallel to Associate Professor. In addition to the qualifications required of the assistant rank, appointees to this rank should have extensive successful experience in scholarly or creative endeavors, and the ability to propose, develop, and manage major research projects as PI. Research should have made an original, substantive contribution in geography or a related discipline. They should show significant potential for continued success in research. Publications should be of high quality. Participation in review of refereed articles and/or grant proposals is expected.

Research Professor

The Research Professor rank is generally parallel to Professor. In addition to the qualifications required of the Associate rank, appointees to this rank should have demonstrated a degree of proficiency sufficient to establish an excellent reputation among regional, national, and international colleagues. Appointees should provide tangible evidence of sound scholarly production in research, publications, professional achievements or other distinguished and creative activity. The candidate shall have demonstrated leadership in geography or a related discipline, e.g., should be recognized by the external community through awards, roles in international and national professional organizations, and serving in editorial roles for peer-reviewed journals.

2. New hires procedures:

New hires in the Post-Doctoral and Research Professor ranks will be hired at the appropriate title based on the position description and their experience. Their title shall correspond to the majority of the appointee's effort. The Chair and the Research Director reviews the candidate's CV and position description to ensure the appropriate title is used.

An initial appointment at Full Research Professor will be reviewed by a college-level committee consisting of at least three faculty members (one tenured Full Professor, and a minimum of two PTK faculty at the highest rank in a relevant title series), who will issue a recommendation to the Dean. If the appointment is for 50% FTE or higher, it will also be reviewed by a review committee constituted by the Office of the Provost.

New hires will be provided with the URL for the Department's policy which includes the URL for the campus guidelines. All unit policies and procedures shall be available online.

3. Promotion procedures:

Research faculty can request consideration for promotion following the below timeline. If approved, promotions are effective the start of the following fiscal year. There is no expectation for minimum, or maximum, time in rank before promotion.

- a. The candidate writes a letter formally requesting consideration for promotion to the Research Director by **December 1st**. This letter should outline the reasons why the candidate believes he/she should be promoted referencing both their specific contract expectations as well as the promotion criteria from this document.
- b. The candidate will provide the Research Director with the following materials no later than **January 1st**:
 - i. An up-to-date and signed CV
(<http://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/currvit.html>) in the campus

standard format for CVs).

- ii. A personal research statement that will outline the Candidate's research goals and professional development.
 - iii. Copies of five relevant publications.
- c. The Research Director will form a committee of three members consisting of the Research Director, the Chair of the Research Faculty Committee (PTK Faculty member), and one other PTK faculty member at, or above, the rank sought. Decisions on promotion will be based on the evaluation criteria and the reviewee's performance in meeting these criteria as outlined in the materials provided. The committee will produce a summary report based on their evaluation
- d. Research Faculty in Geographical Sciences do not normally hold separate, or joint appointments, in other departments. If a Geographical Sciences research faculty member had another appointment in a different unit, the College's procedures on handling promotion reviews across more than one unit would be used.
- e. The Research Director will submit the candidate's package consisting of the materials submitted by the candidate and the committee's summary report to the Chair of the Department. The Chair should receive the promotion package no later than **April 1st**.
- f. The Department Chair reviews the Committee recommendations and the Candidate's package. If the Chair has questions or concerns, he/she may ask the Research Director for clarification and/or additional information.
- g. If the Chair supports promotion, the Chair writes a letter recommending the promotion and sends the package to the Dean's Office. If the Chair does not support promotion, but the Committee did, the package with the Chair's letter is sent to the Dean's Office. If a negative outcome is reached at the college level, the Dean will notify the candidate in writing. If both the Chair and the Committee did not recommend promotion, the Candidate is notified and is not promoted. In the case of a negative outcome, the candidate's contract can be renewed at the existing title and the candidate can request promotion in future years.
- h. In the case of a negative outcome at the departmental level, an appeal can be brought to the rest of the full professors (TT and PTK) (not members of the Committee) provided that (a) The procedure described above was not followed correctly or (b) It is thought that the criteria used for evaluation were inadequate or improper.
- i. The Chair will inform the candidate in writing of the outcome of their promotion request and any associated promotion increase. The College

will determine the minimum salary increases for promotions annually. The promotion salary increase must be consistent for all candidates at a given rank within the title series in any year. Promotions cannot be rescinded at a later date.

4. PTK faculty shall be given representation on committees responsible for the creation, adoption, and revision of unit-level policies and procedures related to appointment, evaluation, and promotion of PTK faculty.
5. Principal Investigators and direct supervisors should mentor junior PTK faculty (Post-Doctoral Associates and Assistant Research Professors) as part of their duties. Mentors shall encourage, support, and assist these faculty members and be available for consultation on matters of professional development. Mentors also need to be frank and honest about the progress toward fulfilling the unit's criteria for promotion. Favorable informal assessments and positive comments by mentors are purely advisory to the faculty member and do not guarantee a favorable promotion decision. Associate Research Professors should be mentored by the Research Director. If junior PTK faculty do not feel they are being mentored, they should meet with the Research Director to discuss. If the Research Director is their principal investigator/mentor, they should meet with the Department Chair.
6. There will be an annual award given by the Department, for meritorious service as a Research Faculty member. The committee making this award will be selected annually by the Research Director.