

CUSF General Body Meeting
University of Maryland College Park (UMUC)
College Park, Maryland

Minutes

Friday, May 10, 2013

| Attendance: | |
|----------------------|--|
| Bowie (2) | Monika Gross |
| Coppin (2) | Virletta Bryant, Chris Brittan-Powell |
| Frostburg (3) | Robert Kauffman, Elesha Ruminski |
| Salisbury (3) | Michael Scott |
| Towson (4) | Jay Zimmerman |
| UB (2) | Stephanie Gibson, John Callahan |
| UMB (5) | Richard Manski |
| UMBC (3) | Drew Alfgren, Roy Rada |
| UMCES (2) | |
| UMCP (6) | William Stuart, Linda Aldoory, Kenneth Holum, William Montgomery, Linda Dillon Mabbs |
| UMES (2) | Bill Chapin |
| UMUC (3) | Betty Jo Mayeske, Margaret Cohen, Joyce Henderson, David Hershfield |
| Guests: | Joann Boughman (USM), JoAnn Goedert (USM) |

Future Meeting Dates for 2012-2013:

June 14, 2013 (Friday) (Cancelled)

UMBC, University of Maryland Baltimore County

CONVENING THE MEETING – 10:00 a.m.

Jay Zimmerman formally convened the meeting at 10:00 a.m.

WELCOME FROM HOST CAMPUS – 10:07 a.m.

Bill Stewart introduced Dr. Juan Uriagereka, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs at College Park. In addition, he added the following saying Bill prefaced his comments with “*I consider the responsibility of any intellectual to offer their expertise to society especially when their views can shape public policy and social injustice.*”

Dr. Juan Uriagereka, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs at College Park, welcomed the group to College Park. Several weeks ago, he reflected how proud he was to be part of this institution (College Park). He kept his remarks brief.

He talked briefly about a faculty issue that they recently addressed. He noted that the University utilizes many types of procedures to attract faculty. However, we don't know how to promote them. He listed many of the types of faculty functions found at the University. They have researchers, instructors, and other functions. In addition, they had dealings with adjuncts and non-tenure track faculty. He noted that they have 2,800 non-tenure track faculty. They put together a major task force to address the issue. He was pleased to report that the final report was overwhelmingly accepted. The report cleaned up faculty responsibilities and provided titles that reflect actual responsibilities and positions. He listed several of the dimensions that organize faculty including research, creativity, creation of knowledge, etc. In addition, you have mentoring, outreach and other services. He indicated that you have faculty who do just one thing which is fine. In the modern university setting, this is necessary. He doesn't care so much about the name but rather about the content of what faculty do. Tenure track faculty still need to focus on the intersection of the three major components of teaching, research, and service. In summary, Dr. Juan Uriagereka considered the recommendations from their report a major contribution.

Again, Dr. Juan Uriagereka welcomed CUSF members and the opportunity to share with members their dimensional approach to PRT.

Joann Boughman noted that System is in the process of putting together a system wide committee on this topic area. She noted that they are moving quickly and we need to provide balance between teaching and research. She added that at one university, faculty were getting tenured but not promoted. They were having trouble getting promoted because they couldn't get the next publication needed for promotion.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – 10:32 a.m.

It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the April CUSF meeting. The motion passed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS – 10:30 a.m.

CUSF Schedule for 2013-2014 – Jay discussed the tentative schedule of CUSF for next year. He considered types of institutions and the inclusion of schools that haven't been included recently. He noted that Frostburg was usually in October and corresponded with fall colors. The advantage of setting the schedule early is that everyone else will need to set their schedule around ours. The group discussed some pros and cons of scheduling meetings. In addition, there was a request to consider the academic calendar also. Jay noted that when the BOR sets their agenda, we may need to readjust ours.

June CUSF Meeting – Jay discussed the need for the June meeting scheduled at UMBC. After a discussion, the consensus was that it was not needed. A motion was made and seconded not to have a June meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT FROM SYSTEM

Joann Boughman, Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, presented her report from System.

Committee on PRT – We will be appointing a taskforce to look at the PRT and she will be talking to Jay regarding appointments to this committee. She noted that it will not be a quick process.

Tuition Remission Proposal – The tuition remission proposal will be presented to the BOR at their June meeting. Joann noted that the provosts were supportive of the proposal so she expects little resistance to the proposal.

College Completion and Retention Act – The legislative session is complete and they need to start moving on the implementation of the new initiatives passed. The main bill was Senate Bill 740, the College Completion and Retention Act. They will need to address the way that we are going to handle dual enrollment programs, develop pathways for students and to develop plans for these students. She will be working with provosts on implementing procedures regarding this Act.

Enhancement Funds – Regarding the budget they received enhancement funds. To receive these funds, they will require accountability measures. In terms of academic transformation, they are going around to the different campus to implement the program.

Performance Based Funding – Performance Based Funding was not off the table. She noted that the workgroup that was working on this for a year will be reconvened. She added that they could live with this approach when it was new funding, and they consider the enhancement funds as new monies. In order to keep these funds and add them to the base funding in the future, they will need to perform well.

Q&A – Joann answered several questions which most clarified her previous comments. She noted that they would need more STEM graduates. The amount of new monies will vary greatly from campus to campus.

Diversity and Closing the Achievement Gap – Student Success Revisited – Joann noted that Jay attended this workshop on behalf of CUSF. People attending this conference shared their best practices with each other. Also, they told each other what didn't work so that others could avoid it. She noted that the achievement gap still exists and it needs to be closed. There are racial, gender, ethnic and other factors entering into the problem.

State Education Plan – Joann indicated that the first draft of the State Plan has been published. There is an emphasis on completion, an emphasis on diversity, an emphasis on excellence, an increased emphasis on entrepreneurship, and the capture of data because they are moving to the Maryland longitudinal system.

Coppin State Report – BOR has appointed a committee to examine a deep and careful look at the challenges at Coppin State University. It included a cadre of representatives and was chaired by Dr. Freeman Hrabowski, President of UMBC. It will make its recommendations public on Monday. There will be a formal meeting of the BOR at Coppin on this Wednesday where they will receive the report. They will have a chance to ask questions on the report. The BOR will vote on its implementation plan at their June meeting. Joann noted that Coppin has some unique challenges. They have a low completion rate and a high transfer rate. They are under-enrolled. It is important to address these specific issues which may be somewhat unique to Coppin.

Q&A – There were several questions from the floor. Most of the questions focused on the process involving the report rather than the content of the report which was not known at this time.

Health Care Act – System is addressing the implications of the health care act. The first issue focuses on the student. They are working on this. Second, involves adjunct faculty and the 30 hour part-time criteria. One issue is whether the employer is the State, the System, or the specific university. The ruling is that it is the State. This ruling has major implications for adjuncts teaching at more than one USM institution and UMUC. The second issue involves the calculation of faculty loads in terms of contact hours. It was determined that the 32 week contract did not have an impact on the determination of part-time status.

Advising and other service commitments need to be determined. Although they are working though the problem, there is a lot more to be determined. Joann noted that it will be important that whatever is decided gets into the faculty handbook or similar document.

Sick Leave Policy – JoAnn Goedert, Assistant Vice Chancellor Administration and Finance, provided a brief overview of the revised sick leave policy and the new accident policy. The policy was in need of consider updating to reflect the changes in Federal law. The motion from ExecCom was seconded and passed unanimously.

MOTION #1306 – Support the changes to the BOR sick leave policy and the new accident policy. [disposition: yea: unanimously]

REPORT ON SHARED GOVERNANCE AT UMCP

Due to the poor tape recorder quality, the report on shared governance report at UMCP was not able to be transcribed.

LUNCH

REPORT ON MHEC – Dr. Danette Howard, Secretary of Higher Education, MHEC

[Secretary's Note: *Special thanks to Stephanie Gibson for taking the following note. The Secretary had another engagement requiring him to leave the meeting.*] Dr. Danette Howard, Secretary of Higher Education, Maryland Higher Education Commission addressed MHEC's role in higher education and some questions regarding the role of MHEC that were raised during previous meetings.

Dr Howard indicated that MHEC does the following functions:

- Coordinating body for higher education in state of MD
- Works closely with system office, 16 community colleges, independent colleges, Morgan & St. Mary's
- Responsible for carrying forward governor's higher education agenda
- MHEC reviews:
 1. new academic programs
 2. any substantial changes and modifications
 3. new degree level

Next, she indicated why does MHEC review these things?

- MHEC has advantage of working across every university in state,
- They work to make sure there is a real need, a workforce demand

Dr. Howard indicated her role in the process. Additionally, Dr. Howard indicated that MHEC examines similar programs offered by other universities and program duplication.

- She indicated that all reviewed programs must receive her signature
- She emphasized that MHEC does not live to deny programs (since August 2011, MHEC has disapproved two program proposals, 98% approval). She added that there must be sound and legitimate reason to deny approval. Before signing a proposal, Dr. Howard calls on analysts and asks lots of questions.

Dr. Howard wanted to address questions about the degree to which MHEC has been non-responsive, including issues about time elapsed and information getting lost. She doesn't know about those issues unless someone contacts her, so do that. She indicated that there might be back and forth with an analyst, but people rarely reach out to her. When contacted she responds immediately. If you're really frustrated, call her directly. She acknowledged that there have been issues, and that she is addressing them.

MHEC is changing. She noted that MHEC has new director of academic affairs. In addition, they have instituted new steps – program proposals will be hosted on their website. Right now they're emailed out. They will be posting FAQ as related to the process.

Q&A – Do they review program eliminations?

- Dr. Howard indicated that they do not necessarily review, but they do have to know about program eliminations. She added that there is a formal process.

Q&A – There was a question regarding online programs? (Note: UMUC Higher Ed program offered in 49 states and not 50 states)

- Have heard many voices asking that it should have been approved. Has not had any official request to do so. In general, if there is a valid need for a program, she indicated that we make sure we're working with campuses so that program is presented uniquely so it can be approved. Must show value added.

Q&A – There is the issue of out of state institutions and for-profit institutions seeking to offer programs in MD. (e.g.: Walden University is offering 12-15 programs).

- MHEC's first responsibility is to students in state of MD, not to USM. Walden tried to circumvent program approval process by registering as only offering distance ed (others have too). Genuine distance ed must only pay a fee and register. Upon review for all programs MHEC realized they were offering more than just online, did some on-the-ground training. MHEC regulations provide that if there is any on ground experience, they must go through program approval process. Fully online programs only pay a fee and announce.

Q&A – She was asked about Morgan's objection to UMUC's program in Community College administration. The program can be offered in 49 states but not Maryland.

- The issue was whether it was unnecessarily duplicative of Morgan. They found that the Morgan program was very successful and diverse.
- It was noted from the floor that there were some time limits involved in that decision, that MHEC in partial approval made it clear that institution should reapply, and that there is a need to collect data on the need for graduates from that program.
- In summary, Dr. Howard's goal is to have every program be of high quality and serve a State of Maryland need. They are willing to help if there are ways to clearly articulate uniqueness/need for program. Much easier to do it on front end than on the back end.

Q&A – Dr. Howard was asked if MHEC takes workforce needs into consideration? If there's a for-profit school wanting to come into Maryland and offer same program, suddenly there will no longer be a need for students from our institutions.

- MHEC uses government data to determine if there is a need. Sometimes the affected institutions have access to more sophisticated data than MHEC. It would be helpful if we included that also. There are a lot of business people on the Commission and they want to see workforce development.

Q&A – A while back Devry wanted to offer an MBA. UB objected, but request was denied. Often the information on approving out of state programs doesn't come to the individual institutions. It was emphasized that there should be communication back to the institution.

- She will look into putting more information on the website.
- Joann added that when an objection is put forward, it's considered. Every program put forward goes on to agenda so you know when it's scheduled.

Q&A – There was concern over a conflict of interest for Joann Boughman and Academic Affairs at System.

- She brings the knowledge she gained as a commissioner to USM. Need to see workforce data, letters from businesses, et cetera...

Q&A – Is the threshold too low? Should there be compelling evidence that programs are really needed?

- She noted that this was a valid point, but can't have it both ways (high approval percentage and low approval percentage). MHEC does not want to approve programs that don't show a valid need. She wants an open and fair marketplace.
- Instead of using a new program, Dr. Howard suggested that institutions look at current programs running programs that are not filled to capacity and see where they might be able to put new students.

Q&A – New numbers of credits for concentrations, minors, etc. Old things approved as concentrations, now need new approval. Now must go through MHEC....making all kinds of mischief.

Q&A – Morgan seems to object to anything from any school within 35 miles of them. Morgan and Towson presidents have met and agreed to be more agreeable.

Q&A – There was a question regarding the civil rights agreement and MHEC?

- She indicated that yes, MHEC is responsible for enforcing agreement. And the program approval process is one of the key measures by which that's enforced.

In conclusion, Dr Howard indicated that program review fees are not the best idea. She thinks that these monies should be a part of their budget. However, the Legislature removed these monies from the general administration budget and they have had to pass the expenses onto the campuses. She added that the analyst salaries actually come from those fees. Funding needs to be restored to the general administration budget. Also, collecting and managing fees is a headache.

Dr. Howard asks for our feedback.

Jay thank Secretary Howard for attending and answering questions on MHEC from CUSF members.

CHAIR'S REPORT

There was no Chair's Report.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, a motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert B. Kauffman

Robert B. Kauffman
Secretary

Attachments: