



COUNCIL of UNIVERSITY
SYSTEM FACULTY

CUSF Council Meeting at Bowie State University
Room 3100 Center for Business and Graduate Studies
14000 Jericho Park Road Bowie, MD 20715
Friday, May 10, 2018
Minutes

Attendees:

Bowie (2)	President Aminta Breaux (guest), Kimetta Hairston (guest), Benjamin Arah, Patricia Westerman
Coppin (2)	Chris Brittan-Powell, Mona Calhoun
Frostburg (3)	Robert Kauffman, Kelly Rock, Ronna Schrum (by phone)
Salisbury (3)	Bobbi Adams
Towson (4)	Beth Clifford, Ryan King-White (by phone), Rajeswari Kolagani (by phone), Jay Zimmerman
UB (2)	Haitham Alkhateeb, Julie Simon
UMB (5)	Karen Clark (by phone)
UMBC (3)	Nagaraj Neerchal, James Stephens, Lina Zhou (by phone)
UMCES (2)	
UMCP (6)	Philip Evers, Janice Reutt-Robey
UMES (2)	Bill Chapin
UMUC (3)	Elizabeth Brunn, Mary Crowley-Farrell, Sabrina Fu
USM	Joann Boughman, Zakiya Lee, Carolyn Skolnick (guest)

10:01 Call to Order—Robert Kauffman

CUSF Chair Robert Kauffman called the meeting to order.

10:02 Approval of April Minutes

April CUSF meeting minutes were moved, seconded, and approved.

10:03 Chair's Report – Robert Kauffman

Robert has included two commentaries in the CUSF packet. A third is in the process of being written. Robert stated that CUSF has had a very successful year, with some very big initiatives accomplished. The joint ombudsperson resolution guidelines will go to campuses. This was the result of a very collaborative effort, led by Robert and CUSS Chair Sherrye Larkin from Coppin. Robert commended CUSF and its Education Policy Committee for its excellent work on academic integrity. Robert also noted that there will be a convening, led by MJ Bishop, on this issue this fall. Robert talked about the parental leave act; inclusion and diversity efforts; and other ongoing matters. He stated that faculty pay was mentioned again in Chancellor's council. This issue will be front and center with presidents and with regents. There is no simple fix, as any approach will necessarily involve the legislature, System, etc. Robert concluded by stating that we have done a very successful job as an advisory body.

10:14 Report from USM – Joann Boughman

Jo started by explaining that there were some challenges on the ombudsperson resolution on the CUSS/staff/union side, especially with unionized staff because they have different rules. The new guidelines reinforce the spirit of the ombudsperson issues. Jo believes that it is in the faculty area that ombuds issues are most critical because of supervisory relationships, etc. So, even though these are not as strong as we had hoped, the ombuds approaches will still be very useful. Some campuses have full-time people, some have a committee approach, and some have other approaches. CUSF members need to ensure that Faculty Senates use their positions to advise their administrations in the rollout of this. People from the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) would be available to come and talk to them.

On faculty salaries, Joann explained that, around 4 years ago, in a budget put forth to the state legislature, faculty salaries were articulated to be a key in that process. The challenge we will have is that enhancement funds placed into this year's budget would be to increase next year to \$20 million then \$33 million then more than that, but the Governor has tied these funds back to workforce development/enhancement. Faculty salaries have slipped on many campuses behind the 85th percentile goal. This discussion point has been written into the Chancellor's goals for next year, and the discussion will include both faculty salaries in general and the need to educate legislators on the compression issue. Part of the issue is that merit is spotty and COLAs do not come consistently. This issue will also be on the CUSP agenda. Joann stated that she handed out a table to provosts yesterday and that her office will put out a summary table.

Robert noted that UMCES and UMUC are not included, and that UMB is different. Also, for UB, the law school is not included in this effort. Jo reported that the provosts asked whether comparison is to peer schools. Jo came away with questions from provosts and she and her team will try to put together some data for them. The questions related to weighting, ranks by tenure versus non-tenured, total versus base versus benefits, whether overloads are included, etc. Joann stated that local variations in cost of living would be a factor, and that recruitment and perception are very important aspects of this process.

Discussion:

Most campuses are seeking more transfer students. The legislature just passed funding for community colleges, so four-year institutions are more likely to teach fewer freshman and sophomores. As such, there may be a need for fewer faculty at USM institutions. If we are employing fewer people, then maybe money will increase per faculty member for that reason. There is also the issue of different pay scales by discipline.

Jo spoke next about changes in prescription drug policies for retirees. Part D in Medicaid was supposed to change in July 2019; now it will change in January 2019. Prescriptions for retirees will be more expensive.

Jo spoke about the symposium on diversifying the faculty, asking for follow-up feedback. Jo reported that she continues to work with people involved with the Stride program and the PROMISE program, and that they are happy to work with any campus personnel to help them develop approaches for diversifying their faculty.

10:37 Panel Discussion on Evaluation

Benjamin Arah "Using the Evaluations to Measure Teaching Effectiveness & Student Satisfaction: An Introduction"

Benjamin Arah introduced the panel, thanking Robert Kauffman and Trish Westerman for providing the idea for the panel and for helping the panel put together the presentation. He also thanked the Faculty Concerns committee for their leadership.

Benjamin stated that faculty evaluation by students is done at most or all campuses. Guiding questions include the following: Do these student evaluations really measure anything? What is the intention? Is it a flawed instrument used against faculty members in tenure and promotion decisions, as some faculty allege?

Philip Evers "What Works at UMCP-What Can Students Evaluate and How Else Can We (Students & Faculty) Evaluate Teaching?"

All faculty want higher student evaluation scores. Philip is in the business school, and he reports that he began his career as a professor knowing virtually nothing about teaching. He stated that his university has a fantastic education department and the faculty therein as well as others on campus know a lot about teaching, so he has worked with the teaching enhancement group within his school of business. Evers also serves as chair of a committee that now is reevaluating course evaluation at College Park. One assumption undergirding this effort is that learning does not equal satisfaction. Student learning, rather, is a function of prior knowledge, individual differences, instructor effectiveness, and measurement error. In conducting student evaluations of faculty, the focus is on measuring instructor effectiveness.

One problem with current student evaluation forms is that they ask students to answer questions they are not qualified or otherwise able to answer. Students can answer questions pertaining to whether the syllabus was made available by the instructor and to what extent the student felt comfortable in the class (because the instructor wasn't making rude comments, etc.) and whether the student received timely and useful feedback on required work. Students are not able, however, to answer questions about whether instructors are using the latest pedagogical approaches or whether instructors' teaching is effective in a global sense.

College Park instituted university-wide course evaluations about 15 years ago, and they piloted then standardized them at that time. These evaluations are technology based and address four goals: 1. Summative evaluation; 2. Formative evaluation; 3. Informative evaluation —i.e., they give some data back to students for their use in choosing courses; and 4. Documenting learning through outcome evaluations.

11:00 Introduction of President Breaux— Benjamin Arah

Benjamin noted the enthusiasm of the campus in welcoming President Breaux last July. He described her as a visionary, transformative, and accessible leader. He also stated that the faculty at Bowie State are excited to work with her in improving the institution for the students and for the community as a whole.

11:03 Bowie State University President Breaux

President Breaux stated that she was thrilled to join the CUSF meeting and that it is a joy to be at Bowie State University. In her remarks, she also noted that change is important and so it is great to hear to hear a faculty member (Benjamin) say that he embraces change. The theme for this year is “Racing to excellence.” Technology is changing the way we deliver education. Many decisions we need to make cannot wait for years of deliberation; our learners are expecting instantaneous change. Shared governance is sharing decision making; and it includes sharing data so that we have informed decision making. President Breaux reported that she has brought in as many voices as she can, including the voices of the faculty, in making decisions. The faculty are on the front lines, seeing critical issues affecting higher education—e.g., mental health, etc. that affect students’ ability to learn. The administration and the faculty also share accountability in ensuring the learning and success of students.

Under the theme, President Breaux outlined the goals of the university, which include academic excellence, student success, and long-term viability of the institution. This includes vocational learning and experiential learning as well as high-impact practices and their effects on the success of our students. Bowie State is a public higher education institution, the first HBCU in Maryland and, as such, we look at diversity in a new and different way.

President Breaux described her style as very collaborative. She tries to be very accessible, keeping the work-life balance in mind. This time of year is what we live for—seeing our students celebrate their accomplishments. The core of the work we are doing starts with respect, and communication is extremely important in every relationship. She engages others with trust, respect, and communication, informed by her background in human relations with my Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology.

Q&A:

Question: What might you suggest to CUSF that we might do?

Breaux: Demonstrate our value and pull together across institutions and work on the message that we are an investment and that we are an economic engine in our communities. That idea is sometimes lost on the general public. We need to communicate that there is a return on the public’s investment of supporting us. That we will help them to meet their needs and the needs of the state. Employers say, “We want to invest with you, but you are not necessarily developing the skills we need.” So are our faculty open to change in this way. We hear a lot about this in our cybersecurity area. We hear from potential employers that a liberal arts major with a

cybersecurity certificate would be helpful to the workforce. This is an area where faculty can be supportive.

Question: You have a large number of international students here at Bowie State. What brings them here?

Breaux: Our largest group is the Saudi students, and we have brought them here through a partnership with the Saudi government. One of the hallmarks of an HBCU is our welcoming nature, so we embrace our students and make them feel welcome here. We do have issues, one of which is religion. We were founded in the basement of a Baptist church. We need to be more open to nonbelievers and to people of all faiths. But even with this issue, our international students feel welcome. And many of them are interested in studying in the STEM areas, which is an area where we are strong.

Question: As an HBCU, what percentage of your students are still African-American?

Breaux: It is now about 82%. And this has changed a bit, and I wonder why we are not doing more in the Latino community. It requires intentionality.

11:27 Panel Discussion on Evaluation (continued)

Philip Evers further described how course evaluation is done at College Park: There is an undergraduate course evaluation instrument, done electronically, which consists of 15 questions used in all courses. All questions except one are in ranking format. The responses of the first eight questions go to department chairs and deans as well as instructors. There is also have one open-ended question, and the problem with it is that students can be nasty, helpful, or hurtful. Faculty struggle with this open-ended question. There are also seven questions whose responses are shared with students. Academic departments may also add a question, if they wish. Faculty evaluation also includes peer evaluations. Within business school, there are pedagogy experts whom faculty are permitted to invite into classes to observe teaching. There is also a campus-based teaching and learning transformation group, which can assist in the evaluation process.

Mona Calhoun "Assessing the Evaluations and Incorporating Recommendations"

Mona Calhoun next provided information regarding She stated that faculty need to be in the correct mindset to receive the students' responses: faculty should be prepared to look for opportunities to improve teaching approaches; to see the evaluations as communication tools from the student to the faculty member; to realize that they are snapshots only; to be aware that evaluations are more positive in courses in which students tend to do well. The results need to be viewed objectively and not personally. Faculty should be encouraged to review materials in privacy; give themselves time and space to review the evaluation information; to see how the information fits into one's teaching goals, departmental goals and institutional goals. The information may be used to drive other, more informal evaluations that faculty may develop themselves for their courses. It is important to address students' concerns or confusion immediately and to give them feedback. When faculty receive negative evaluations from students, they should acknowledge that it hurts and sometimes makes faculty angry. This feeling should be acknowledged and then faculty should try to put it aside look forward to how to use the feedback from students.

Julie Simon "What's Happening at University of Baltimore (UB)"

Five years ago, UB's evaluations began to be completed in an online process. UB has 4 colleges and UB had 5 different evaluation forms. The electronic response rate is <52%, whereas our response rate with paper was 80%. And the response rate continues to decrease. The problem appears to be that students lack motivation to complete evaluations because students believe that they have no reason to complete evaluations. Evaluations are not routinely done in class. Some colleagues have done this, even now with the online format. More typically, faculty send evaluations to students and then send them again one week later and two weeks later. There is a 10-15% increase the morning the emails are sent. Data are mostly bimodal: Students seem either to love their instructors or hate them.

UB has a course evaluation committee populated by faculty and others. Recommendations from this group include: Faculty and deans are asked to encourage students to complete evaluations; campus-wide evaluation will be developed; each question will have a scale that is pointed in the same direction; and schools/colleges are encouraged to make evaluations more succinct. The four evaluations will share some common questions about student learning and student satisfaction. There will also be some open-ended response options. Recommendations have now been presented to the Faculty Senate and to the College Senates. Faculty will vote in the first fall meeting. Also, the office of testing services has offered to make evaluations mobile. There was discussion about the propriety of "bribing" students to complete evaluations and about student concerns that anonymity is not ensured.

Elizabeth Brunn "Faculty and Student Evaluations at UMUC"

At UMUC teaching occurs predominantly in an online format, so faculty cannot have students complete evaluations in class. Until four years ago, evaluations were required before the institution would allow students to complete their work for a particular week. Students were very opposed to this, so UMUC stopped requiring it. Research indicates that there is very little internal consistency in responses (i.e., by the same student). Also, switching from textbooks to open educational resources (OERs) affected evaluations and response rates tremendously. UMUC is currently debating mandatory versus nonmandatory student completion of faculty evaluations and is discussing the importance of having students evaluate only what they are capable of evaluating. Some changes have been recommended, and there will be a pilot of the new process for collecting and making use of feedback from students. UMUC is also discussing how to collect analytics on the subject. Faculty retention should not depend on good evaluations, for a number of reasons. So, for now, UMUC has imposed a hiatus on using student evaluations for promotion decisions. Faculty have been asked what they would like to see from student evaluation. UMUC administrators have shared information about putting together a model like the one at Liverpool University in which the faculty member can evaluate the students in the class and see if this aligns with student evaluations of faculty for that course.

Beth Clifford (TU) "Research Bias in Student Evaluations."

Student evaluations do figure into hiring decisions, retention (tenure/promotion) decisions, and course enrollments. Quite a bit of research on gender bias in student evaluation of faculty. An AAUP survey of over 9000 faculty members yielded the following results: Concern that there are more bullying and abusive comments in online evaluation; some women faculty members and

members of color reportedly receive negative comments on appearance; and bias can, of course, happen on other dimensions as well.

Analysis of “rate my professor” (RMP) indicates that negative evaluation may occur partly because, at some institutions, students are not permitted to see results. RMP is widely seen as problematic by faculty, but it is very much used by students. As such, it can impact course enrollments, which are important, especially pre-tenure. And it can share people’s perceptions and, thus, affect future student expectations.

Students use words relating more to intelligence for male professors; more to nurturing for females. “Brilliant” is used more often of male faculty than females. Students expect women to have more gender-role stereotypical traits.

Another study, which consisted of a content analysis of course evaluations and RMP indicated that women are more likely to be referred to as teacher than professor, and that men received higher ratings on all issues, other than administrative items.

A May 4, 2018^h editorial in *Inside Higher Education* is critical of evaluation benchmarks and their application. The editorial advocates comparing like subject matter courses to each other. In conclusion, if administrators are going to rely heavily on evaluations, they should be educated about potential biases. And this may be a good issue for CUSF to take up next year. A suggestion was made that perhaps student course evaluations could be reframed as the student’s course experience, rather than evaluating teaching performance. On the latter, as discussed, most students are unqualified to do so.

Robert thanked the panel and closed by saying that CUSF needs to determine where to go with this.

12:36 Lunch -- Brainstorming Session for Topics to Undertake Next Year - CUSF Chair-Elect Trish Westerman

Bobbi Adams suggested that we talk about the legal right to unionize. Where do we stand on collective bargaining, and where do we want to go?

Chris Brittan-Powell suggested discussing matters relating to curriculum, perhaps focused on studying ways to serve as a body to help our institutions to look at curricular reform; sharing of resources; and interinstitutional participation on academic programs. Perhaps we could explore this and set up some dialog.

Elizabeth Brunn recommended discussing student demographics/description, including examining the variety of students that the institutions have, in order that we may enhance our pedagogical approaches and administrative decision making to reflect changes in this area. We could take the lead in developing best practices.

Nagaraj Neerchal suggested that we keep the conversation going about student evaluation systems at the System level. This could be a potential discussion item at a Senate Chairs' meeting.

Chris: Under the Inclusion/Diversity (I/D) initiative, we may wish to expand the discussion of the disparate evaluation of faculty of color and female faculty.

Elizabeth suggested that we determine how to get more CUSF members to attend meetings. Haitham suggested a "supporting student success" theme. This could include focus on how we promote deep learning, impact on student outcomes, etc. Also, developmental education would be a good topic to explore: It costs students money but does not count toward graduation. It holds some students back from graduation. Are there shared practices available on this issue? Joann responded that many campuses have moved from full developmental courses to corequisite remediation.

Bobbi stated that the legislative mandate to submit textbooks by a certain deadline can be problematic. Some publishers have not yet by then provided exam copies, etc., so it makes it difficult to select books. Joann responded that the rationale was to permit students to obtain texts (and for bookstores to get enough used texts) in timely manner.

Jay Zimmerman would like for CUSF to discuss the optional versus state plan sick leave differential. CUSF has looked at it in the past, but he would like us to keep our eye on this inequity. One possible partial solution would be a collegial sick leave banking system.

12:57 Follow-up to Panel on Faculty Evaluation

Robert stated that this issue may be something that MJ Bishop can shed some light on, so we may want to bring her in this fall. Robert asked: What do we do with this? What are the next steps? One approach may be, as mentioned by Nagaraj, to share this info through Senate Chairs so that something does get accomplished on the campuses.

Sharon Reutt-Robey asked, with regard to inappropriate and threatening language from students on open-ended questions, whether these responses could be flagged so that faculty do not have to see it.

Phillip Evers stated that the evaluations are not, in fact, truly anonymous. As such, if some responses are threatening, the institution could follow up if someone decides where to draw the line. Also, with regard to filling out course evaluations, Philip has started to say to students, "Use this as an opportunity for you to give feedback to others." It is good training for their future roles and careers.

Joann noted that sharing ideas is great, but CUSF does not want to mandate anything on this for all campuses. It would be good, however, to determine the best way for CUSF to obtain information on how best to assess faculty for the appointment, rank, and tenure (ART) process. Jo would encourage CUSF also to determine alignment among evaluations and ART and other processes.

Elizabeth asked whether there is an effectiveness and efficiency (E&E) aspect to this across campuses.

Jo said that there may be, and that data analytics may also help here, in that assessment could include how students do not only in one course but in the following required course as well. Sharon said that we may wish to include in our discussion the issue, especially for pre-tenured faculty members, of how to help them to view and to use the results of student evaluations without feeling demoralized or intimidated. We could talk about how to help them to see the content as formative assessment that can help them to improve their teaching. Joann offered to talk to MJ Bishop in the Academic Transformation group about this matter, adding that the improvement and engagement of faculty often comes out of teaching and learning centers.

1:16 Carolyn Skolnick, Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources

Healthy Working Families: This provision allows employees to use leave when they are sick or when family members are sick or for “safe leave,” that is, when employee must be absent because of issues related to domestic abuse, etc. Policies will be amended to include safe leave and to broaden the definition of who is included as an immediate family member. The policy does not apply to adjunct faculty or to graduate assistants, unless they are employed under a contract that allows the institution to dock pay for absence for sick leave, etc.

Prescription Drug Update: Under Medicare part D, there was a gap in coverage in certain circumstances. The federal government announced it would close that gap in July 2019. Now it will be January 2019. As a result, the Maryland general assembly moved up the date to January 2019 at which retired employees would no longer receive this coverage.

Q&A:

Question: Could the state remove healthcare for working employees who are Medicare eligible?

Carolyn: The state technically could do that, but politically that would be problematic. The state has other tools, including the ability to increase premium rates. It could require state employees to contribute higher amounts toward their own health care costs. But state unions (especially AFSCME) have been getting more involved, so this will likely preserve current policies.

Joann added that when the “doughnut hole” closes, System expects that it will not be as generous a coverage plan as USM retirees have had up to this point. Instead of having to pay relatively little per prescription, the costs will increase.

Question: With regard to sick leave, faculty accrue massive amounts of sick leave, which vanishes when we retire, if we are on the optional retirement plan (ORP). On the other hand, if faculty are in the state pension plan, they would get credit for sick leave. Is there anything we can do about this?

Carolyn: If you look at the general trend across the country, especially in the private sector, it is going away from providing sick leave. The trend is toward paid time off, which the employee uses as the employee wishes. There are some disadvantages in the

pension system, including the following: the employee is not vested until the employee has worked in the system for 10 years; the coverage is not mobile to another university that is not part of the system; the employee must contribute a certain percentage to the pension system (which is not required in ORP), etc.

1:39 Passing the Gavel – Robert Kauffman

Robert announced officially that this will be his last CUSF meeting as CUSF chair and wished Trish Westerman the best as she assumes the chair in August.

1:40 Senate Chairs’ Meeting – Robert Kauffman

Nagaraj commended Chancellor Caret for his accessibility and for the candid discussion at the meeting.

1:41 BOR Report – Robert Kauffman

Information about BOR policy 2.1.25 regarding compensation can be found in the CUSF packet.

Robert announced the motion by the CUSF executive committee not to meet in June. It was seconded and approved.

1:52 Adjournment – Robert Kauffman

The meeting was adjourned by Robert Kauffman.