



COUNCIL of UNIVERSITY
SYSTEM FACULTY

CUSF Council Meeting at Salisbury University
1101 Camden Ave. Salisbury, MD 21801
4th Floor Board Room – Academic Commons
Friday, April 12, 2019

Minutes

Attendees by School	Role	Presence
UMUC Elizabeth Brunn Sabrina Fu Mary Crowley-Farrell Chris Farrell	Rep/CUSF Secretary Representative Alternate Representative Guest	All Present in Person
UMB Susan Antol Karen Clark	Representative Rep/At Large	All Present in Person
FSU Robert Kauffman John Lombardi	Rep/Past Chair Representative	Present in Person Present by Phone/Zoom
UMES Bill Chapin	Representative	Present in Person
CSU Erica Covington Chris Brittan-Powell Aerian Tatum	Representative Representative Alt Representative	All Present in Person
SU Vitus Ozoke Ellen Schaefer-Salins Bobbie Adams Karen Olmstead Chrys Eagan	Representative Representative Representative Provost Senate Chair	Present in Person Present in Person Present in Person Present in Person Present by Zoom
TU Ryan King-White Beth Clifford Raj Kolagani Jay Zimmerman	Representative Representative Representative Representative	All Present in Person
UMBC Nagaraj Neerchal	Rep/At Large	
UMD Philip Evers Jason Geary	Rep/ Vice Chair Representative	All Present in Person

UB Julie Simon		
BSU Patricia Westerman Ben Arah Karen Brenberg	Representative Chair Representative Alt/ Representative	Present by Zoom Present in Person Present by Zoom Present in Person
USM Jo Boughman MJ Bishop Carolyn Skolnik	Acad & Student Affairs Kirwan Center HR	Present in Person Present in Person Present by Zoom
Randy Bass	Guest Speaker	Present by Zoom

10:00 Call to Order; Welcome and Introduction– Patricia Westerman, CUSF Chair

Thanks to Ellen for the beautiful job in hosting the meeting. Introduction of Dr. Karen Olmstead the Provost for Salisbury.

10:05 Greetings – Salisbury Provost, Dr. Karen Olmstead

Dr. Olmstead touched on a few major projects and shared governance at SU:

- SU started in 1925 as a normal school not unlike many of the other USM regional schools. Its role today is not dissimilar, as it is a regional public comprehensive university. This means that they are one of the “workhorse” institutions. Seventy percent of the students are 4 year undergraduate students with 25% graduate school attendees.
- SU is the cultural and commercial hub of the region and takes this role very seriously. They are active in presenting music festivals, glassblowing, revitalizing the downtown area with their entrepreneurship program, and provide health and human services to the community.
- SU has just been named the top regional school with the highest number of female graduates at 37%.
- Currently faculty initiatives are focused on doubling down on student outcomes which focus on national recognition. One tool they have used to do this is to create learning communities that have 8-10 members who seek out projects that encourage student and faculty success. To date they have won a news NSF grant to look at water resources. The groups are often interdisciplinary and create projects like entrepreneurship, and student competitions. They have five Fulbright Scholars.
- Shared governance at SU is very important and with a new president and provost. The school is seeking to encourage more faculty involvement. The learning communities and new adjunct faculty online group have been very successful in giving voice to faculty involvement along with the existing faculty senate.

10:20 State of Shared Governance – Dr. Chrys Egan, Chair of Faculty Senate

Dr. Egan joined us via Zoom, her main points were:

- SU has both formal shared governance and informal. Informal is being promoted more in an effort to get the heavy workload done. “We often ask, who can go to the conference

and how can we work together to bring the information back to the group? We want to work together to complement our workloads and not waste time.”

- Shared governance is a priority at SU.
- Innovation in creating new programs and gaining active participants among faculty is challenged by “trust” issues with administration and each other. A problem that is common to all schools.
- The formal shared governance structure has a Faculty Senate, separate adjunct faculty group, staff group, and student group. The fifth group is a consortium made up of all groups. This group tends to deal with issues that no one group can handle (e.g. safety).
- President and provost go to all the meetings.
- One major problem is the fact that Salisbury is geographically isolated. The enrollment management issues have the school “fishing” in the same pond for students, hence the push for greater visibility in the nation and beyond.
- Another challenge is faculty workload. How do we create innovative programs and encourage student success with hands on faculty and limited resources. Our budget being one of the smallest in the system. This goes hand in glove with the trust issues that was eluded to earlier.

Q and A

Sabrina asked for more detail as to how the Senate worked. Chrys said they had 18 senators and 6 at large. There was a strong competition among faculty for the positions. President and Provost were often at the meetings along with Deans and VP’s. Jay wanted to know about the adjunct voice. Again Chrys explained that they had a separate group that meets online and work often with the provost and president as well as full-time faculty.

10:35 Approval of CUSF Council Minutes – March 2019 at UMCES

Motion was made and seconded, no discussion was had. Passed unanimously.

10:40 Parental Leave Policy - Carolyn Skolnik, USM Associate Vice Chancellor of HR

The major points to take away on the amended parental leave act:

- Expands the benefits from 8-12 weeks without need for supplemental leave to kick in.
- Parent must take the leave within 6 months of the birth, adoption, etc. of the child. No intermittent use will apply.
- Carolyn noted that the leave is very generous and is a great tool for faculty recruitment.

Jo commented that the faculty now have a very generous policy. Bobbie wanted to know if this leave would affect tenure. Jo and Carolyn both said that faculty need to look to their school for those questions. Also discussed was the retiree drug benefits question. The following was explained: Retiree drug benefits bill is likely to pass. The current bill will break the retirees in to two groups. The first are those retirees who retired before 2011. They will have cap of \$550 individual/ \$2000 family. The second will those who retire after 2011. They will have a \$2500 cap. Drugs that are life sustaining will be paid for by the state. Lisa Gray said the legislature looked favorably on the joint resolution with CUSS. Bill wanted to know why the split between retirees? The reply was money. That was the best the state could do and remain close to budget.

11:02 Preparing Faculty for the Future of Higher Education Series - Dr. Randy Bass, Vice Provost for Education and Professor of English, Georgetown University

Dr. Bass said in thinking about teaching in the next 15 years we must consider asking several questions first. They are:

- What will the condition of knowledge, technology learning be like?
- What will work be like?
- What kind of graduate would we want?
- How can an entire university work together to accomplish the goals needed to prepare that graduate?

Dr. Bass suggested that the graduate of tomorrow would need to have the following skills to be successful in the workforce:

- Analytical thinking
- Active learning, evaluative and systems analysis skills
- Creativity
- Organized
- Tech design
- Critical thinking and analysis
- Complex problem solving
- Emotional intelligence
- Leadership and social influence/Collaborative and team building

Current challenge for faculty is to work together to combine the two paradigms- disintegrative and integrative (mentioned in the article he wrote and which is attached for context) to create engaged student learning to meet the skill goals needed for the future workplace. The former paradigm is to separate and silo education. It has a modular approach (“MOOC” classes, learning experiences are separate and programs have boundaries). The integrative approach is where learning is decoupled from formal boundaries and integrated to present curriculum which presents a whole or systems thinking approach to learning. Knowledge skills and learning are integrated to create teaching experiences that look at the entire problem rather than part. Dr. Bass gave the example of the physics teacher who used technology to teach the students the basics and which gave her time to take the students to the critical thinking aspects of the content. This required the faculty member to know how to use technology to serve the student and how to separate the foundation knowledge from the higher levels of Bloom’s taxonomy.

Q and A: Erica asked how he reconciles the use of analytics as integrative when it is often disintegrative. Bass suggested that the difference is how you use the tool. Analytics must serve the concept being taught not be the concept. Bass points out that machines or algorithms plus human judgment will make a better teacher in the future. It is not about scaling education but about how to use machines to enhance human connection. Further, it is not just about helping students succeed but how we can enhance the maximum number of students with the maximum number of diverse learning backgrounds.

Sabrina asked when and where do we consider starting to bundle? Do we start in the earlier grades? Bass thought that was a beginning but there was no reason to wait to see the effect that would have on the student.

Raj said I do know how you can do this when in her experience she is having to teach the core skills like writing, along with the foundations of physics. Bass replied that is why it is important to get the whole university behind the paradigm approach.

Elizabeth asked given the current movement away from degrees and the entrance of badging, certificates etc. and students coming in and out of the workplace for formal education how can you solve the problem of too many students having too diverse a background in the classroom? Will bundling be enough? Bass remarked that is somewhat unknown right now and something to consider as an institution for the future. How much will the machines teach and how much will faculty? Systems thinking and interdisciplinary initiatives will certainly be emphasized. MJ commented on the idea that sometimes disintegration is good in teaching. Bass said yes but again this goes back to the question of bundling.

Jo and Karen suggested that this is a mapping problem to some extent how do we thread the different skills together to make a successful student learning experience.

Bass concluded with these points:

- institutions needed to recognize the centrality of dispositional learning to the future of human learning;
- need for a greater integration of applied and experiential learning;
- curriculum development needs to be considered like that of a diversified stock portfolio, many kinds of experiences for the student; and
- faculty need to consider team design, delivery, flexible modular.

12:00 LUNCH and Committee Meetings

Committees:

- 1) Legislative Activities
- 2) Educational Policy (Academic Affairs)
- 3) Faculty Concerns
- 4) Membership and Rules

Committee Tasks:

- 1) Take and record attendance; give attendance to CUSF Secretary Elizabeth Brunn
- 2) Work on action items

12:52 Nominations

CUSF Secretary

Bill asked for nominations for secretary. There were none. Karen Clark was elected unanimously for secretary after motion and second to have an open vote.

Nominations for Two At-Large Positions

Bill explained how the election process would work. Everyone will be given a blank piece of paper and asked to vote for two candidates. The one or ones with a clear majority of the voting members present will win. If there is no clear majority, the one with the fewest votes will be dropped from the ballot. The remaining will be voted on again. The process will continue until a clear majority is obtained for both positions. Chris Brittan-Powell, Elizabeth Brunn, Phil Evers, Robert Kauffman and Nagaraj Neerchal were nominated.

1:02 Nagaraj made a motion to withdraw his name from the ballot. It was passed unanimously.

1:05 Jay made a motion to have the candidates make a 2-minute speech explaining why they should be elected but no Q and A. The motion was seconded. Brief discussion was had as to the reason for the motion and the time constraints. Jay said that because of the number of people running and the nature of the election it would be beneficial to hear from the candidates. People were concerned that the process would go on but Trish assured them she would keep people to the two minutes. The vote was called and the motion passed.

Speeches are summarized as follows:

- Chris said he was from Coppin and as a result had a unique perspective on the concerns of CUSF. He has also worked with MHEC.
- Elizabeth suggested that her work with the academic integrity issue had been considerable and showed her ability to lead a successful CUSF policy initiative. She also expressed the fact that as the representative from UMUC, she had a perspective of CUSF that was needed on Ex Com.
- Phil said that he was anxious to continue his work on Ex Com but in a less demanding role. He would like to continue to look at shared practices and coming from the largest institution, he thought that was a good voice to be heard on Ex Com.
- Robert recounted his various accomplishments this year while fulfilling his role on Ex Com as past chair. He believed his leadership experience would be useful for the new work that CUSF is doing.

1:25 Bill Chapin announced the election of the two at-large nominees who obtained the most votes - Robert Kauffman and Phil Evers.

1:26 Committee Reports and Resolutions – Postponed due to time

1:27 Discussion of Faculty Workload Policy and Guidelines - Joann Boughman and MJ Bishop (USM)

Jo reported that the new workload policy was given to the Presidents for review. It removed the 3-credit control feature that was used in the past and added language to broaden the definition to include work performed by faculty outside of teaching. The guidelines addition to the policy gives more specific concepts that schools should use in their evaluations and add new categories for performance evaluation. This change in reporting for next year was also a feature. The metrics have been separated and will not have to go to BOR. The major change in the metrics to be reported is that instead of reporting an average they can report on the average. Jo made the point that how these changes affect tenure and promotion depends on the institution which places a new burden on faculty to become involved with the implementation of the new policy on the organizational level at home.

Q and A- Jay wanted to know if USM will be collecting more data on this and keeping this stored or just what they need going forward. MJ said they have what they needed they will not be going after a continued complement of data going forward. Trish asked if the new policy can be sent to the Senate Chairs for the meeting. It was agreed that it was fine to do so.

1:55 Trish wanted to look at the work that CUSF has been doing this year so that members would be looking at the action plan items for the May meeting for next year. The slides are attached.

2:00 Adjournment

Schedule of Future CUSF Meetings		
Month	Schedule of CUSF Council Meetings for 2018-19 Academic Year	Location
May	Thursday, May 16, 2019	TU
June	Tuesday, June 18, 2019 (optional)	UB
Schedule of Senate Chairs' Meetings		
Semester	Schedule of Senate Chairs' Meetings for 2018-19 Academic Year	Location
Spring	Wednesday, April 24, 2019	USM, Adelphi