



COUNCIL of UNIVERSITY  
SYSTEM FACULTY

**CUSF Council Meeting at  
University System of Maryland Office  
3300 Metzert Road ~ Adelphi, MD 20783  
Thursday, January 17, 2019**

**Minutes**

<b>Attendee</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Presence</b>
<b>UMUC Elizabeth Brunn Sabrina Fu Mary Crowley-Farrell</b>	<b>Rep and Secretary Representative Alternate</b>	<b>Present Present Present by Phone</b>
<b>UB Julie Simon</b>	<b>Representative</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>FSU Kelly Rock Robert Kauffman John Lombardi</b>	<b>Representative Rep and Past Chair Representative</b>	<b>Present Present Present by Phone</b>
<b>TU Elizabeth Clifford Jay Zimmerman Rajeswari Kolagani Ryan King-White</b>	<b>Representative Representative Representative Representative</b>	<b>Present Present Present Present</b>
<b>CSU Ericka Covington Aerian Tatum Chris Brittan-Powell</b>	<b>Representative Alt Representative Representative</b>	<b>Present Present Present</b>
<b>UMBC Sreedevi Sampath</b>	<b>Representative</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>UMB Susan Antol</b>	<b>Representative</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>UMCP Marcia Shofner Phil Evers</b>	<b>Representative Rep and Vice Chair</b>	<b>Present Present</b>
<b>SU Ellen Schaefer-Salins Jennifer Jewell Dave Parker</b>	<b>Representative Representative Guest</b>	<b>Present Present Present</b>
<b>UMCES Mike Wilberg</b>	<b>Representative</b>	<b>Present</b>

<b>UMES</b> <b>William Chapin</b>	<b>Representative</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>BSU</b> <b>David Anyino</b>	<b>Representative</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>USM</b> <b>MJ Bishop</b> <b>Joann Boughman</b>	<b>Representative</b> <b>Representative</b>	<b>Present</b> <b>Present</b>

**10:00 Call to Order; Welcome and Introductions – Philip Evers, CUSF Vice Chair**  
Special Greeting to Dave Parker as a welcome guest

**10:05 Approval of CUSF Council Minutes – December 2018**  
Motion made, seconded and carried unanimously

**10:07 Update from USM – Joann Boughman**

A major focus for USM in the immediate future is the work centered around the current legislative session and getting the Governor’s budget passed. The budget strongly supports our needs. In addition, we want to make sure that the Kirwan Center funding and the enhancement funds are favorable to the system. The State Legislative session started last week, and 95 bills have been dropped so far. There are only two we care about, veterans’ benefits and the 2019 implementation on the effects of prescription drug benefit changes. Changes in the GI bill benefits could affect many students who use the benefits to pay for their education. This discussion is one for us to watch but it is not likely we will be able to do much to influence its outcome as it controlled by Federal law. Another bill to watch is one that supplements prescription coverage for retirees placing them in the same position they were in before the 2019 implementation of the decreased coverage. The bill has met with favorable response from state senators after the huge outcry from retirees and future retirees when they were reminded of the change implementation date. For many, this was the first time they were made aware of the change. The governor responded with a one-year stop gap measure to keep things at the status quo however, the new bill would make the measure long-term. One other topic mentioned by Jo is that of our salary compression request of the Board. While it is out of the budget cycle, there is some feedback that the legislature is looking at the issue.

Other topics on the horizon that Joann suggests are of interest to CUSF are:

- The Board of Regents has hired a consulting firm to examine the shared governance challenges that arose from the College Park football issues. They recognize that processes used were deficient and need to be examined and corrected. We will be interviewed at some point on the matter.
- A new work group has been set up to examine the risk management challenges surrounding Title IX. The group will be cross sectional and are tasked with coming up with system wide comments on the topic of training, allowing cross examination in the process review of a complaint (no court room experience is wanted by schools or system), and to look at degrees of severity of the offense and what responses are reasonable. The recent 2-hour face to face requirement policy for title IX training implemented by UMBC may be considered a standard for all schools and there is debate

as to how well this would be accepted. CUSF may be asked for comments on this but it is not known for sure now.

- Jo suggested that USM is looking at the tenure and workload issue closely and strongly suggests that we get our recommendations into the work group looking at revamping the policy.
- Pursuant to Jo's office procedure BOR policies are viewed to keep them current and are periodically revamped. In addition to workload tenure policies Jo said they would be looking at technology as it influences the policy. Elizabeth mentioned the actual policy for use of technology on campus hasn't been changed in many years. Jo and MJ said they had forgotten about that and would add that to the list.

### **10:30 Community Building Discussion of Higher Education Topics - Shared Practices**

Phil asked the group to break into small groups and to make sure you were with people of different schools. The topic under discussion was; what do you as a faculty member learn from the comments and ratings from student evaluations and how to you address them?

The results were:

- The biggest problem is the response rate. It is hard to take seriously the comments of students if only a few respond and they either love or hate you. Some faculty encourage student participation by setting aside time in the class, bringing cookies, using social media, giving extra credit points, asking for responses on google docs mid class rather than waiting for the end of class.
- Another concern is the problem that standard forms often have questions that do not apply to the course or faculty member being evaluated. For instance, having a question about how the professor conducts a lab when the class is English 101 is often answered by the student despite it being inapplicable. Since standard forms have no n/a option in the rating function the answered rating score will be included in the overall rating.
- Phil suggested one idea of approaching students is to make it a professional activity. Employers often ask employees to rate their direct report and it is expected to be done in a professional and constructive manner. This is a good opportunity to use as a teaching example.
- Finally, it was a reluctant conclusion that while faculty always considered student concerns in work performance, dramatic change was not a serious result of the students' comments. This was largely believed because the assessment tools used are never offer a realistic measure of actual performance.

### **11:13 Future of Higher Education Series: Open Educational Resources - Dr. MJ Bishop, Director of William E. Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation**

*MJ opened with the following points of context:*

Currently Maryland students spend 223 million dollars annually on textbooks. MJ explained the reasoning behind the development of OER's came from the Textbook Act of 2017 which sought to reduce the cost of college education for students by using fewer or less costly material and textbooks. This act was founded on research that revealed that 11% of student cost comes from textbooks. The results of this huge expense led to the following behavior on the part of students: (65%) are not buying them at all. 48% percent use the cost of the books as a factor in not buying them until they receive their financial aid checks (missing a few weeks of work at the beginning and some use the cost of books as a consideration in making their course choices. The movement

toward OER's is slow and (excepting UMUC from this figure) 89 courses at 19 Maryland schools are using OER's as teaching tools. Given that we know students want textbooks and learning material in general to be cheaper or free, the question for discussion is can we sustain a valuable course curriculum using OER's? Here are some of the points made:

- OER's do not have to be free. They can be low cost and publishers know this and as a result they are beginning to compete with free materials by providing alternative materials and courses for students for \$25.00 or under. OER's that appear to be free are not necessarily free when factoring in the student who prints all the downloads. It might be cheaper to buy the publisher's material.
- The big plus to OER's is the fact that they can be adopted and adapted freely.
- Choice of instructional materials is the purview of the faculty. Cost and quality do not always work together to give the student the best of both worlds. Faculty can be adamant about giving access to adaptability and adoptability of their work.
- To sustain an OER effort support needs to come from outside to build resources in the library, to encourage faculty participation in creating free copyright material. This may be in terms of monetary or incentives of another type
- Schools will need to develop a way to measure quality of the OER, peer evaluation, ADA compliance, curation, discoverability, support for teaching and learning with OER's and a maintenance plan for updating material.

Beth discussed the idea of promotion/tenure concerns if credit is not measured. OER's currently do not count in the assessment of this measure. She also noted that giving people license to adopt and adapt can change the product significantly for the worse. Phil and others commented on the idea of why would someone want to give up their license for free? MJ said it would be a point for discussion does the university own the OER (work for hire) or the faculty member. Julie brought up the idea of creative arts. How can people who teach art or photography like Julie give free license to their product and stay competitive? She also asked how can a non-tenure member get credit for their work? Also discussed was the idea of digital rights and types of OER's. How will sponsored research become free, for instance? MJ replied that these are all issues that need to be addressed to make OER's sustainable, but the future of Higher Ed classrooms will see them playing an important role.

MJ encouraged us to go to the Kirwan Center website to see references and material sources that are open access.

## **12:10 LUNCH/Committee Meetings**

### **1:18 Committee Reports**

**Legislative Affairs** - Susan Antol reported for the chair who was absent. The committee met and said they recognized that Annapolis Day was coming up soon, but they did not know the date. MJ said it looked like it would be February 20<sup>th</sup> and that Andrew or Patrick will get with Nagaraj to go over the agenda.

**Rule and Membership** - Robert made a motion that elections for new EX COM officers be conducted pursuant to the policy adopted last year. In February, nominations for Chair and Vice Chair will be made and closed. In March voting on nominations for Chair and Vice Chair will

occur. In the case of Vice Chair nominations will reopen and close before the vote to allow for nominations from the floor. Nominations for Secretary and At large offices will be made and closed. In April, the elections for Secretary and At-large positions will be made. In the case of all positions nominations will be reopened and closed before the vote so that nominations from the floor can occur. In the case of the At-Large position the lowest vote is deleted. The motion was seconded by Elizabeth no discussion was had and the motion passed unanimously.

**Ed Policy** - Elizabeth stated that the committee was in the planning stages for the Webinar for the convening groups as well as the convening itself. Also, the committee discussed possible topics for BOR policy recommendation topics. Some suggestions were the zero-tolerance policy for appropriate misconduct, the requirement that universities set up a separate academic integrity policy from existing student conduct policies, and the question of noting transcripts of offenders. Elizabeth asked the full CUSF group to consider these ideas and any they may have or would like the committee to examine. MJ suggested that the committee wait to see if something comes from the convening in March. Elizabeth said that was fine because we are just trying to get the topics set up for research and review next year.

**Faculty Affairs** - Ryan announced that Jo wanted an advisory opinion on the workload definition for faculty to take to the Regents. She would like a paragraph that gives an overview of the work faculty do different from the credit load requirement. Ryan explained that a draft paragraph was open for comment on Slack and Raj explained how to connect with the conversation. Join Slack and then go to CUSF/USM and join the conversation.

**Fiscal Affairs** - Robert moved to pass the Faculty Salary resolution (pages 9 and 10 of Faculty Salary report) and it was seconded by Jay. Discussion included Julie commenting that the figures are misleading and that salaries are inequitable as a result. Several others agreed and some discussion suggested that more review may be needed in the future. Robert said he would explore whether system should consider looking at UMUC for guidance on making salaries for adjuncts and others more competitive. He also said he would review the professional schools to see how they skew the numbers for the other faculty especially since so many of the schools now have professional programs. Robert also pointed out that universities themselves should be looking at this issue to plan for a more equitable pay scale. The motion was carried unanimously.

## **2:00 Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn was made by Elizabeth and seconded by Robert. It passed unanimously.

<b>Schedule of Future CUSF Meetings</b>		
<b>Month</b>	<b>Schedule of CUSF Council Meetings for 2018-19 Academic Year</b>	<b>Location</b>
February	Wednesday, Feb 13, 2019	UMUC
March	Wednesday, March 13, 2019	UMCES/UMB/UMBC Inst. of Marine & Environmental Tech. (IMET), Baltimore
April	Friday, April 12, 2019	SU
May	Thursday, May 16, 2019	TU
June	Tuesday, June 18, 2019 (optional)	UB
<b>Schedule of Senate Chairs' Meetings</b>		
<b>Semester</b>	<b>Schedule of Senate Chairs' Meetings for 2018-19 Academic Year</b>	<b>Location</b>
Spring	Wednesday, April 24, 2019	USM, Adelphi