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# CUSF MEETING

# *Coppin State University*

# *Thursday, December 8, 2016 10:00 a.m*.

# Minutes

**ATTENDANCE:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Bowie (2) | Benjamin Arah, Patricia Westerman  |
| Coppin (2) | Virletta Bryant, Chris Brittan-Powell, Claudia Nelson (Senate Chair) |
| Frostburg (3) | Robert Kauffman |
| Salisbury (3)  | Bobbi Adams |
| Towson (4) | Beth Clifford, Ryan King-White, Raj Kolagani |
| UB (2) | Julie Simon, Jessica Sowa |
| UMB (5) | Karen Clark, Isabel Rambob |
| UMBC (3)  | Nagaraj Neerchal, James Stephens |
| UMCES (2)  |  |
| UMCP (6)  | Drew Baden, Qingbin Cui, Philip Evers, Ethan Kaplan, Madlen Simon |
| UMES (2)  | Bill Chapin |
| UMUC (3) | Elizabeth Brunn, Sabrina Fu, Albert Nekimken |
| USM | Joann Boughman, Zakiya Lee |
| Guest | George Mehaffy, Vice President for Academic Leadership and Change, American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) |

*10:05—Call to order*

Robert Kauffman called the meeting to order.

*10:06 Greetings from campus*

Claudia Nelson, CSU Senate Chair, introduced Dr. Maria Thompson, President of CSU, after explaining that the president is committed to shared governance.

President Thompson welcomed us to Coppin State University and gave a brief description of the woman for whom the institution was named, Fannie Jackson Coppin. Dr. Thompson explained the legacy of this h important historical figure as community-engaged teaching and learning. A major goal of the university it to attain the Carnegie designation of community-engaged university, which only three schools in Maryland (Loyola, Towson, and AACC) have done thus far.

With regard to shared governance, Dr. Thompson explained that her relationship to shared governance has changed as she has changed positions. She explained that shared governance, especially at a public institution, really starts with the governor. There are people beyond the campus looking at data and making decisions about our institutions. For example, Senate Bill 1052 may change access to research opportunities. And the governor delegates some of his authority to the regents, and they delegate some to the presidents and then that is distributed throughout the university. Shared governance decisions, especially off campus, are data-rich. So Dr. Thompson spoke of the importance of "democratized data” and of "networked leadership,” both of which are enabled by information technology. The focus needs to be on collaborative efforts to maximize student success and financial sustainability, all enabled by data-informed decision making and action.

Dr. Thompson hold a shared governance session a few times a semester. Since our June meeting, the shared governance groups have talked about live data related to the USM dashboard. That data focuses one’s attention on why student success. Dr. Thompson again urged democratized data, stating that she wants everybody to have access to the dashboard data.

Another goal of the institution is to make changes in Peoplesoft, so that each person can look at his or her actions and see how each action affects academic quality/success and financial sustainability. This illuminates that everybody's action, such as deciding how many sections of each course will be taught in a semester, is a budget issue.

Discussion:

Nagaraj: You emphasize that this is live data. The downside can be the panic that can occur as a result of that. How do you balance free access with preventing overreaction?

Dr. Thompson: If I'm not panicking, that's a start. Organizational learning is also an important component of networked leadership. Also, the dashboard goes back 5 years, so the context is there. In addition, there has to be ongoing conversation. The times of panic can lead to conversation with someone one does not ordinarily talk to, and that is a great opportunity to learn what that person does and how it impacts student success. This fosters better understanding of roles.

*10:36 Approval of CUSF minutes for November 2016*

Minutes were approved, with one addition: Add Sabrina Fu’s name as an attendee.

*10:37 Welcome from CUSS*

Sherrye Larkin, Chair of CUSS thanked attendees for attending the joint meeting last month. From the perspective of CUSS, there were pros and cons of the joint meeting. The primary area for improvement was that members would have liked to have had more one-on-one interactions with a regent. Regent Brady has accepted CUSS’s invitation to join them for a spring meeting.

BOR staff awards are coming up soon. CUSS has a goal to have 8 staff nominated from each university, 2 in each of the four categories. Sherrye urged attendees to consider nominating staff for an award.

CUSS has been discussing the possibility of having an ombudsman, in the model of the ombudsman program at UMB, which staff there have found to be very beneficial. CUSS is discussing a recommendation for a centralized ombudsman at the System level to talk to about issues that staff do not want to take to Human Resources.

Discussion:

Albert: Could you comment on CUSS's experience with collective bargaining?

Sherrye: Transparency is often not shared at our institutions. As for those who are not part of the union, we try to share as much as we can with them, but they can't interact with us on some matters. We tend to stay quiet and follow the faculty's lead.

Kolagani: Can someone be nominated posthumously for an award?

Sherrye: No.

Robert: I have asked Regent Brady to attend one of our meetings, and he has agreed. Also, on the ombudsman matter, check with Mike Murtagh at Frostburg. And on the November 2016 joint meeting, the collaboration with the other chairs has been fruitful. We will have joint meetings only if we have things in common that we wish to discuss.

*10:48 CSU Senate Chair—Claudia Nelson*

Dr. Nelson was introduced by Chris: Faculty here have been focusing more on community engagement, and Claudia has been at the forefront of that and has done an excellent job on that.

Claudia described her primary objective with regard to shared governance as access to and communication/collaboration with other institutional leaders. Because of our discussions, our new president, who has been here for a year, has reestablished a shared governance council and has established a university-wide budget committee. She has attended every opportunity that faculty have invited her to meet with us. We need to focus also on shared governance at the local level, that is, within our departments and our colleges.

Special policies/initiatives: Faculty here have not evaluated chairs or deans. This should change. And there must be some outcomes to these evaluations. We will have a new provost on January 3, and we will discuss this matter. We are also interested in talking about having an ombudsman. We have a grievance committee, but sometimes it is helpful to have someone else to talk to before something gets to the level of a grievance. Bullying, incivility, etc. can impact our work environment, so we need to address these problems.

Discussion:

Albert: Do you have ability to send an email to all faculty?

Claudia: I do.

Nagaraj: How are Faculty Senators chosen?

Claudia: Senators are elected by their areas. The size of the department determines how many elected representatives that department has. The Faculty Senate President and Vice President are elected by entire faculty, not just Senators. May I ask if each of you has the opportunity to evaluate the chairs and deans?

Many CUSF members evaluate chairs periodically. In some institutions, chairs evaluate deans, or faculty evaluate deans. The process for selection of department chairs differs at different campuses as well, and even across departments within a campus in some cases. At UMUC, it is completely different. It is more akin to getting a job at a business.

On some campuses, faculty evaluate the provost and the president, but the problem is what happens with the information. When we complete the shared governance survey submitted by Senate chairs, reporting goes to the Chancellor, who can choose to use it or not. He has apparently chosen to use it in his evaluation of the presidents. Faculty evaluation of the deans and the provost can be shared with the chancellor, if the president does not appear to be using the information appropriately, as it is a reflection on the president in his or her role.

We discussed the problem of low participation in shared governance at many campuses. How is that working here at CSU, especially with young faculty?

Claudia: It has to do with relationships also. You have to talk to faculty. Your role as a Senator is to get your departmental faculty involved and engaged. You need to make sure that the faculty know that they are valued.

*11:14 Report from USM*

Jo: The budget is in the governor's hands, and we have USM staff who continue to make our pleas. We know that revenues came in short in the state of Maryland, so we are in for tight budget times. I know we will have a proposal for a tuition increase next year, and we do not know whether the governor will buy down some or all of that. The governor's proposal is made public in January.

From the Presidents' and Regents' retreats—The emphasis within Effectiveness and Efficiency (E&E) is moving more toward academic E&E. We want to capture auditable data. E&E is easier on the administrative side. On the academic side, emphasis is on effectiveness. Some examples include: If we retain rather than lose and have to replace a student, it is a gain in student success and it saves us money. If a student passes a redesigned course that he or she may not otherwise have passed, we are more efficient in graduating that student. We are now graduating more students with a shorter time to graduation with a flat or lower amount of debt and with a more diverse student population. That is effectiveness and that is efficiency. We have many faculty involved in these workgroups, and we are not trying to downsize faculty.

Diversity/Inclusion (D/I) Council: Benjamin Arah will report on this. It has been renamed the I/D Council. An inclusive, welcoming culture of a campus provides a foundation on which we can celebrate diversity.

Discussion:

Albert: Do university presidents serve at pleasure of the chancellor?

Jo: They serve at the pleasure of the Board. They have contracts, but the Board can break or buy out the contracts. Presidents are under a continuous evaluation model. There is also an annual evaluation by the chancellor. Also, each president meets once a year with the Board. Evaluation can be 360, meaning that information is gathered from every segment of the population that touches that office. There could also be an evaluation by an outside person who may do an administrative review and/or offer bolstering/counseling of the president.

Raj Kolagani: On E&E, how are faculty chosen for participation?

Jo: We turn to CUSF for representation. And then there are other faculty appointed as well, in some cases.

Bobbi Adams: Here is a problem we are seeing. There is a law that we need to get textbook recommendations in early. This decreases our effectiveness as instructors. I am named to teach a course for the next semester, and then a week later I need to submit my textbook recommendations. There is no time to evaluate new materials.

Jo: Textbook law was mostly related to cost. And it did drive some of the costs down. The legislature is trying to protect citizens and students. I would encourage that processes on campuses improve so that, for example, decisions are made earlier about which courses instructors will teach.

Bobbi: Textbook decision date is much too early, especially in spring for fall.

Robert: What would need to be done to change this?

Jo: This relates to open-educational resources.

Claudia: One of the problems with early adoption is that publishers often update materials between the date you've ordered and the date that the semester starts. I don't believe this issue was considered.

Sowa: What is the level of compliance of this? And in making this legislative decision, what faculty input was taken into account?

Robert: To summarize, the issue is how we should approach this. Will we need to go back to the legislature on it?

Jo: Yes. And it will not happen this session. We are trying to get a fund to support faculty in gathering case studies, etc. that could be formalized into a resource that could be input into the open-educational resource system.

Elizabeth Brunn: We have issues re. copyrights, and re. the fact that education is becoming a business so someone puts out an article that's available for a couple months then it's pulled off the web and offered for sale. We are not allowed, for example, to use Harvard open resources.

Robert: We will address this topic in our January meeting.

Benjamin: What is the status of the discussion of bachelor’s degrees at community colleges (CCs)?

Jo: We will fight this. We work with our CCs very well. We will work to get better 2+2 programs with them in order to be responsive to the issue.

Robert: On E&E, I initially disliked this, but it has been quite successful in helping the System to show legislature how we've leveraged our large numbers to save resources.

Sowa: Do you give awards for cost-saving innovations?

Jo: Yes, as part of BOR awards for staff and faculty.

*11:40 George Mehaffey, Vice President for Academic Leadership and Change, American Association of State Colleges and Universities*

George opened discussion about the changing professoriate and the forces impinging on it: The professoriate exists in a troubled context, and is undergoing a great deal of change and pain. One force is declining state support. At the current rate, by 2059, there would no longer be universities funded by the state. States will run them but will not pay for them. A consequence is that students are paying more than the state now, so the question is where is the tipping point, where increasing numbers of students will stop attending college? We may have already reached it. There are fewer students going to college today than two years ago. Students are paying more than states are. Do students, then, have the right to act as customers?

Another factor: the flattening of the pipeline. The year 2013 was, up through 2024, the peak in the number of students graduating from high school. In 2024, 45% of college students will be Hispanic students. We want more students, but where will we get them? International students are one possibility. Then the legislature starts to show concern about in-state students who are being blocked out.

Rise of nonprofits: For-profits will come roaring back under the new administration. Half of states now use performance funding.

Rapid change. Financial stress. New population of students who have historically not done well in higher education. Increasing suspicion that we are elitist and unconcerned with world around us.

Faculty: 70% are adjuncts now. This rate will not change radically unless it increases. How many of our first-year students are taught by adjuncts? Part of the problem with adjuncts is that the label means many different things. In Wisconsin, tenure is being challenged. The recent election will embolden many people across the US to go after and limit tenure.

Salaries in many places are stagnant. In many states, thereis a concern that benefits for faculty are better than those for other public-sector employees.

Adjunct model, especially "freeway fliers": This negatively affects student success, partly because there is no professional development, no evaluation, compensation inequities, and no engagement with students except teaching

Tenure-track model: There is a deemphasis on teaching, limited flexibility to changes in student population, limited emphasis on service and civic engagement

Trends for the future: Teaching should be a collaborative effort, using crowd-sourcing. One example is that 16,000 sections of PSYC 101 are taught in the US per semester. AASCU is working on having faculty work together to develop these courses.

Faculty need to spend time assessing the effectiveness of their online teaching (as AAUP said in the 1930s).

Carl Lyman's research involved looking at two faculty teaching physics, one that was new and that he had schooled; the other who was long-term. New faculty produced twice the learning outcomes because they teach from a notion of cognition, how students are thinking. Faculty are simply not trained in teaching, but only in doing research on their subject matter.

Our institutions are changing rapidly but our models for teaching are not changing much at all.

We need to change.

AASCU is working with 44 colleges on "reimagining the first year of college." The general education curriculum is broken. We need to rethink the first year and make it fundamentally different from the other three years.

Discussion:

Bobbi: Our students who come in with so many AP credits that they don't take any first-year courses. What do you do about that?

George: Experiential activities in the community, centered around what interests the students, is the secret to engagement and success.

Jessica Sowa: Isn't it better for students to attend City-Year or Americorps? Isn't that more effective than offering it at a university? And isn't college more than a job training environment?

George: Is it a better model to lose 20-50% of our students?

Jessica: Maybe we need to do a better job of explaining to students why we think these general education courses are important?

George: Students have always come to college to get a job. Rather than say that’s not important, we need to explain things better. But also job skills for the 21st century are experiential skills. We don't explain this well.

Raj: Team teaching can help us to offer what students want, but team teaching is complex and difficult to implement. Also, even at a comprehensive university, research is becoming the only thing that matters in promotion from Associate to Full Professor, so how do we find time to improve teaching, assess teaching, etc? There has to be a balance.

George: Many comprehensives are "research wanna bes" and this is problematic.

Sabrina: I have no time for research, let alone civic engagement. And civic engagement is not evaluated as part of our tenure and promotion process.

Chris: Your statement that institutions are designed for us and not for our students. How then would the professoriate be redesigned?

George: An analog for us can be found in medicine, which has been corporatized. This is the way we are destined to go in the next 10 to 20 years. They've moved from a focus on the physician to a focus on the patient, e.g., assessing how many patients are made well? This type of assessment will be the focus for us as well. Students are not our customers; they are our patients. They and their professors need to collaborate and communicate about where students are and where they are going. The professoriate needs to change so that students are working, and are more active than instructors are in the classroom. Also, advising should be taken completely away from faculty. Faculty should have office hours to sit with students and talk about their hopes, dreams, fears, etc.

Beth: It’s interesting to use medicine as an analog. Neither education nor medicine should be a for-profit enterprise. That's not the right model, especially with the boutique doctors versus the others for the rest of the people. We should not emulate healthcare. Also, faculty advising is very effective because the faculty know the students best.

George: That's a fair critique. My reaction is that Yale and others are like the boutique doctors. But we've also created, through that educational system, a very bifurcated society.

Claudia: I'm hearing that we need to retreat back to reason for public education and its impact local and nationally by focusing on teaching and researching things that can be useful for faculty and students to take back to our local areas and use to improve lives.

George: We need to do better at preparing people for jobs in order to offer hope to people and in order to improve communities.

Elizabeth Brunn: Traditionally, we look at the intelligentsia and at their role in defining society. If we redefine faculty so that they become more practical, if we do not stand apart, if we do not focus on becoming good citizens of the country, we are depriving the country of people who provide expertise in important areas. Also, as a parent of a high school student, I wonder about this "reimagining of the first year." The process of getting into a school and going to the school, this process itself pushes students to have AP credits, etc. The student has been prepared for his or her first year in a model that is preexisting, so to change it may do a disservice to this.

George: Most of the reimagining is around specific practices that can help students be more successful. But it's hard for faculty to think that the institution is a co-contributor to student failure.

*12:32 Lunch and continued discussion with George*

George: We use a one-size-fits-all model. This is a problem. Is there a faculty handbook for the system or for each campus?

Robert: Each institution has its own handbook and each president acts as a CEO. And it's a very diverse system.

George: It would be interesting to conduct a study of how the different campuses define tenure-track and other expectations. And to what extent is it the non-written but cultural expectations that guide this process? Also, freeway fliers are harmful to students and they're harmful to the professoriate because it gives the illusion that anyone can come in here and do this.

Robert: We instituted our master's program in 1996 and we had a weekend campus for it. And we violated the 50% tenured faculty rule because we brought back people from the profession to teach the program. Now so many faculty are working from home that we may not have that sense of community that we've always had.

George: Having students in cohorts helps to build a sense of community as well.

Sowa: We need to suspend teaching evaluations for three years and let instructors try innovative things.

Raj: We are required to give grade distributions in our annual reports. If grades are high, you're frowned upon because it's assumed that you have low standards.

Bill Chapin: I'm curious as to whether you who completed your doctoral training after I did were taught how to teach.

Many of us had good mentoring and experience in teaching during graduate school; others did not. In the latter case, it was presumably related to discipline, job market, etc.

*1:19 Chair's report*

Robert: Regarding BPower, look at the written materials and you will see that there is a concerted effort to work on economic development in Baltimore, including the interaction of System institutions with entities in the community. Maybe we could have a session where we have some discussion on this. Also, on Tippsy math, we may want to have someone come in and talk to us about the issue of remedial math and basic math: "20% of students who take remedial math will graduate."

*1:24 Logo*

Executive committee chose a logo it likes and has provided it as a recommendation for CUSF to consider. Page 26. Motion moved and seconded.

Julie: You need to remove University System of Maryland. It will not size down. Also, values of colors need to be tweaked because, on the black and white image, it will offer more contrast.

Robert: We have a motion to approve, with amendments. Approved unanimously.

*1:30 Reapportionment*

Bill Chapin: Maybe we'll have it by January.

*1:32 Regent's award*

Nagaraj: Is it possible to have a report by the committee saying how many people were nominated per campus and what criteria were used to evaluate the nominees-- what info is committee looking for-- from CUSF member at-large?

Benjamin: We met Friday and made decisions. We are writing up the report now.

Zakiya: There's never input from the general body. Criteria are all available online. The committee decided on a process that's happened across the last several award cycles. The chair of CUSF appoints the chair of the faculty awards committee who seeks participation from CUSF.

Robert: We may want to formalize the election of the chair of the evaluation committee.

*1:38 Old/new business*

Julie: Please review the Equal and Safe Access Resolution, reaffirming our commitment to provide our students safe and equal access to education. UB is formally asking this body to look at passing this resolution.

Robert: I suggest that "CUSF encourages presidents and faculty organizations on each campus to follow the spirit of the UB Equal and Safe Access Resolution."

Motion is moved and seconded.

Motion passes.

*1:44 Adjourn*