



Minutes

*CUSF Council Meeting at Frostburg State University (FSU)
Atkinson Room, Lane Center
Frostburg State University*

Tuesday, October 18, 2016

ATTENDANCE:

Bowie (2)	Patricia Westerman
Coppin (2)	Virletta Bryant (by phone), Chris Brittan-Powell (by phone)
Frostburg (3)	Kelly Hall, Pete Herzfeld, Robert Kauffman
Salisbury (3)	
Towson (4)	Beth Clifford, Ryan King-White
UB (2)	Julie Simon (by phone), Jessica Sowa (by phone)
UMB (5)	Karen Clark (by phone),
UMBC (3)	Nagaraj Neerchal, James Stephens, Joyce Tenney
UMCES (2)	David Nelson
UMCP (6)	Philip Evers, Ethan Kaplan
UMES (2)	Bill Chapin
UMUC (3)	Elizabeth Brunn, Sabrina Fu, David Hershfield (by phone), Albert Nekimken
USM	Joann Boughman

10:02 Call to Order—Robert Kauffman

10:03 Welcome and Introductions – Robert Kauffman

10:05 Greetings from campus – Dr. Ron Nowaczyk, President

Robert Kauffman introduced Dr. Nowaczyk, new president of Frostburg State University. Robert stated that the two had not yet had a lot of business together, but that the president's tenure had been a seamless transition from last year to this year. The president was at one time a Senate Chair, so he is very familiar with shared governance. He has been setting a positive tone and doing a lot of good things, for including bringing in a highly capable person to facilitate the strategic planning process.

Dr. Nowalczyk welcomed attendees, stating that he spent 21 years as a psychology faculty member at Clemson, including on the Faculty Senate. He greatly values the input of faculty. What he values most from CUSF is to provide him with insights as to what CUSF members see occurring that has state-wide implications. Frostburg gets more students from three other counties than from their local county (Alleghany). Faculty have raised the issue of preparedness of students entering the university. The president considers finding resources to support student success as a priority. He appreciates everything CUSF is doing.

Nagaraj Neerchal asked whether FSU is still in a marketing mode, as it was at CUSF's last visit.

Dr. Nowalczyk stated that everybody is fighting for the same pie of 18 year olds, which is not going to grow for about another nine years. We are facing much more competition from privates than before because they are fighting for their survival. They are paying for many students to attend there (even with 60% scholarships). We need to be looking more at increasing the student population, including transfer students (whom privates recruit as readily). My challenge to faculty and recruiting staff is how to make attending here as easy as possible for students from day one. The other market is the adult learner. I'm asking our faculty and staff to look at whether there are graduates who are looking to improve their positions in their jobs, through certificates, etc. as well as for people who may be making career changes. How do we attract them and provide what they need?

Albert Nekimken asked Dr. Nowalczyk's thoughts about online education and the use of adjuncts.

Dr. Nowalczyk: If online education is done right, graduate online education could be especially promising, as these students are better prepared, so this type of situation is more rewarding for faculty. Adjuncts have a role. I believe we should use adjuncts judiciously. Decisions about academic programs must belong to the faculty in the departments. We want to make sure that adjuncts are plugged in to the department and that the faculty feel comfortable with the adjuncts in their programs.

10:20 Approval of CUSF Council Minutes – September 2016

Albert asked why the consensus, in his recollection, about the UMUC Academic Advisory Board (AAB) and whether CUSF should accept the selections of its CUSF representatives was not included in the minutes.

Robert and Nagaraj suggested that the membership and rules committee talk about this issue and determine whether the CUSF constitution and by-laws should be reviewed to determine whether revisions of definitions of terms such as "faculty" should be recommended.

10:30 Report from Senate Chair at FSU – Michael Murtagh***Moved to 12:30

10:45 John Wolfe, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs/Diversity and Academic – Dr.

Wolfe was not able to join us.

11:15 Report from USM – Joann Boughman, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

1. Diversity/Inclusion: (also known as D/Equity/I)—The BOR, especially the chair, Jim Brady is very invested in these issues across our campuses. They recognize that greater diversity and that a sense of belongingness are key to the success of students. They recognize from the students' perspective that the number one item is diversification of faculty. So it is important for faculty to respect this opinion of the students. There is interest in the process of recruitment/appointment/tenure/ and promotion of faculty. We all come to the table with our own biases. USM is looking at a model used at UMBC of training the faculty before each search. We may be rolling this idea out to other institutions.

Students are interested in whether faculty of color or underrepresented faculty are tenured at the same rate as majority faculty. If this is the case, why is it happening? One reason may be that they are often loaded with more responsibilities, including more time with underrepresented students, thus reducing the time available for research. Also, areas of research may differ from those of more traditional researchers. Joann is turning to faculty leadership to be watchful and to look at what role we might play in leadership on this issue.

Students are interested in transgender issues, including restrooms. USM believes that people can use facilities according to their gender of identity. All USM campuses are identifying restrooms, retrofitting, and making room in new buildings for gender-inclusive or all-gender (NOT "gender neutral") restrooms.

Students are concerned about attendance policies. Attendance is in the purview of faculty. Students say that there are some cases in which faculty do not understand the depth of the emotional trauma and pain of the students when certain things happen in the community. Faculty are not being receptive to students' excuse notes from counselors and others who state that students are not emotionally strong enough to attend for a few days after a crisis, such as the Orlando shooting, etc.

The USM is still working on the Efficiency and Effectiveness (E&E) initiative. On the academic side, USM is beginning to capture data on improved student outcomes in the long run (which represents effectiveness). It is important that USM capture data that allow for reallocation of resources, including classroom space. If students are graduating at a higher rate with a shorter time to degree on a more diverse student population, then it shows that we are all doing our jobs more effectively.

At the Shaeffer Center, a group from UB was called to conduct an assessment of Baltimore City Community College (BCCC). BCCC has not been highly functioning for some time. It is funded state-wide, whereas other CCs are funded by their counties. Several options were suggested by this group, including that BCCC come into the USM. The USM wants BCCC to be successful, but is not sure if it is best to include BCCC. BCCC position is that they do not wish to be taken into a system; they wish to remain independent.

Questions for Joann:

Kelly Hall asked what dysfunction has been noted at BCCC.

Joann: The retention rate is abysmal, and the success rate of students is very low.

Nagaraj asked about BCCC's size.

Joann: About 4000 students; and not sure of how many faculty.

Ryan King-White: How does diversity training before a search work?

Joann deferred to Nagaraj, who explained: When a position is approved, the search committee (which the Dean makes sure is diverse) is formed. The chair of the committee must take a workshop, and the information presented in the workshop is then presented by the search committee chair to the department. Information includes what types of questions one may or may not ask; implicit bias; how to ask questions;

etc.

Elizabeth Brunn: Does the training emphasize diversity of opinion, or just demographic diversity?

Nagaraj: Diversity in the broadest sense

Elizabeth: I never seem to hear someone ask whether the candidate has a different viewpoint, challenges traditional notions, etc.

Nagaraj: We keep diversity in mind by being flexible about the exact type of expertise needed to round out the department. Otherwise, we always end up with one type of person, and with very little diversity.

Joann: From the D/I council, USM will start to encourage more of this type of discussion.

Nagaraj recommended that this diversity information be shared in different venues, such as at the USM new chairs workshop.

Joann noted this, and then stated that it is important to think about the idea of how leadership (including the BOR) hears the disparate voices and whether various groups (no matter how small) have opportunities to register their concerns. The BOR recently made an exception to allow a small student group to present to BOR without using the required 48-hour notice. The issues involved were: (1) Renaming of buildings, and (2) State use industries—these students take exceptions of use of "black bodies" to make furniture, etc. for the universities. The back story is that there was a study done of the prisons engaged in this effort and it found that incarcerated persons actually value this opportunity.

BOR determined that it would no longer permit students who are not members of recognized groups to present in front of the BOR. So where could these students go? To the D/I Council? Council pushed back because the group has no authority to take any action, especially as it would relate to any one campus. Would there be expectations that the Council could take actions? There is a need to manage expectations, especially with student groups. How, then, should disparate ideas be heard at the campus and system level? CUSF may wish to discuss this at the joint councils' meeting (with 4 regents, including the chair of the BOR) next month. Perhaps this group will wish to think about this question as we prepare for this meeting.

Albert: Most of the BOR meetings are private. May they go into private session any time they choose?

Joann: There is law governing what issues may be taken into private session.

Nagaraj: On the issue of student concerns, it appears that the D/I Council may be the best place for students to go with such issues, but we also do not want to overburden the D/I Council.

JB: The chairman of the BOR is interested very much in finding solutions to perceived problems related to D/I. I remind him often that much of the engagement must take place on the individual campuses.

Elizabeth: Expectation levels are important. Students will have an expectation that someone will do something about their concerns. How do you bring the issue back into the system and make it work? How do you ensure that the students feel respected by the fact that their viewpoints are being taken seriously and that it is not just a matter of pretending to listen?

Joann: BOR typically hears from chairs of CUSS, CUSF, and the student Council. The joint meeting will provide a different type of opportunity for dialogue. I expect the regents to throw the question back to us and ask us how to address it.

Sabrina Fu: Perhaps regents could visit different institutions to engage with students about difficult matters, even if solutions are not provided right away.

JB: All regents visit some institutions every year. A good suggestion might be that as students are organizing a forum related to one of these matters, perhaps a regent could be invited to visit the campus on that day to be engaged in the discussion.

Beth: I'm a huge fan of that kind of dialogue, and at Towson there have been numerous dialogues of that type. All the discussion in the world, however, does not seem to amount to anything and that is why the activist students have become so much more engaged and active.

Virletta: A few years ago, when there was a workgroup to look at sexual assault policies. One result was a climate survey. Have data been collected on these student concerns? If not, is that a good starting place so that we can move the dialogue to objective concerns that could be looked at in a meaningful way?

Joann: A sexual misconduct climate survey was done on all campuses in spring; data are with MHEC. My major concern is that the response rate was in single digits, so we may not get much useful information. Also, the D/I council has a workgroup interested in qualitative and quantitative data collection related to broader climate issues on our campuses. Over the next few months, there will likely be a recommendation from this group to survey on our campuses.

11:20 Logo:

Robert Kauffman gives summation of the "beautiful, clean" new logo that is consistent with the USM logo. System apparently wants "University System of Maryland" on the CUSF logo. We will work behind the scenes to clear this logjam, as we believe the inclusion of "University System of Maryland" would make our logo very confusing. We need to come to some agreement on it. **After a motion and a second, the logo was adopted unanimously.**

11:25 Reapportionment:

Robert: Reapportionment is based on the number of full-time faculty. As of now, UMB would receive one more representative; UMUC would lose one representative.

Dave Hershfield, chair of UMUC adjuncts: We only have about 120 full-time faculty.

Robert: That's why you have only one representative.

Dave: So this is only a recommendation at this stage?

Robert: Yes. There will be further discussion of this at the December meeting.

11:30 a.m. Committee meetings—

Academic Affairs, Faculty Affairs, Legislative Affairs, and Membership and Rules Committees

Discussion Topic: *Making CUSF more visible on campus* – Five suggestions

Questions for Regents at November Joint meeting (last chance)

Other business

12:00 Lunch

12:35 Mike Murtagh—Chair, Faculty Senate

Mike spoke about the state of shared governance at FSU: I am in my 4th year as Senate Chair. At FSU, we have two-year terms and we are term limited at two terms. Shared governance is alive and well at Frostburg. There is a respect that is shared between administration and faculty. We have a new president and he has been great. One thing that saddens me in terms of shared governance. There has been created an ad hoc university council, made up of three faculty members, three staff members, and three students in an attempt to ensure that voices across the institution can be heard. The bigger issues of the campus are discussed there. Ron calls it an ad hoc committee because he wants to make sure it works before deciding whether to make it permanent.

There is also a strategic planning group, and planning is happening right now. It is very interesting in how it is being done. Instead of the usual small group, we are about 50 people and we are being trained as a group as to how to do strategic planning. And we believe this will be a real plan, with things we care

about, and written in a way that's quantifiable. We have slightly more faculty than non-faculty engaged in this process.

Over the last three years, we've done some really great things:

- changing some processes such as combining tenure and promotion process instead of how we used to do it, which was go up for tenure and then go up the next year for promotion
- workload modification
- bullying of faculty by other faculty issue. On this issue, we took about two years to talk about it, put together an ad hoc committee, took some training, developed an approach, and I am proud of it on a couple different levels. First, where we are on this issue is where we were on sexual harassment a couple decades ago. FSU has a code of conduct for faculty and we made changes in our grievance process that created an ombudsperson. If a person feels bullied, there is a group to which he or she can talk confidentially. The group can help him or her figure out whether the behavior is appropriate or not. The person can now request mediation which will bring the bully and the bullied person together to work through the problem. If it does not work, the person can still file a grievance. And the grievance committee process was also given more teeth. People who are elected to be part of ombudspersons' team receive trainings in mediation.

Beth asked how this approach addresses repeat or serial bullies

Mike said that, in this case, the name of the alleged serial bully would be given to someone, such as the provost, who can ensure that the behavior is stopped.

Beth asked what happens if the bullying occurs within the tenure/promotion review or some other confidential process.

Mike stated that he has never heard of bullying at this stage. Generally, the bullying involves a younger/newer faculty member being given a quid pro quo by a senior faculty member.

Robert asked if there is a USM policy that relates to this.

Joann stated that there are several things that may relate in the USM ART document. And there are a couple other areas in other policies.

Robert recommended that we could bring the BOR policies into CUSF meetings to discuss in our committee meetings.

12:57 Anthony Foster, Associate Vice Chancellor for Accountability and Planning – Update on USM Strategic Plan

Robert Kauffman referred us to the powerpoint beginning on page 16 of the CUSF packet.

Anthony joined us by phone to provide this update:

The USM 10-year plan is mandated by law, and it fits under the state postsecondary plan. The 10-year plan includes information about how the USM institutions benefit the state; contribute to state, economic development; etc. Institutional plans should align with both the 10-year plan and the state plan. The last plan that the BOR approved was in 2010. The group began in 2015 to work on the next plan. The work began with a review of "hits and misses" of the current plan and developing an approach to revising and updating it. The BOR considered the 2010 plan very successful. In some areas, goals have been met; in others, there are different directions that might be taken. There are five high-level goals and, under each goal, five themes. The first step was to conduct an in-house stakeholder survey of presidents, all major VPs, provosts, and council chairs to see what they thought of the plan. The survey had a 53% completion rate.

Findings include:

1. Strong support for current goals and themes of plan, with some discussion of tweaking of themes.
2. General concerns: Under the area of what needs to be addressed, funding inadequacy was one of the big issues. A second issue was funding equity across institutions. A third was the impact of technology disruption. Fourth, there is a desire for greater collaboration among institutions. Fifth, affordability and student debt need to be discussed. And finally, there is a need to hold major discussions about diversity and inclusion.
 - a. Access, affordability, and attainment: Need to reconsider timeline to the goal of 28,000 degrees. Need to look at resources needed, including more financial aid, planning more strategically for growth, less versus more costly institutions, etc.
 - b. In the area of economic development, we need to increase STEM degree production: Need to go beyond generic STEM goal and look at specific areas, e.g., IT, cybersecurity, etc. Deemphasize areas like biology, which we overproduce. Also need to look at nursing and other health related programs. Need to look closely at market needs.
Need also to increase Research and Development (R&D): Need more collaborative degree programs; need to look beyond greater DC/Baltimore area; Need to get comprehensive institutions involved in this effort
 - c. Academic transformation: Look at competency-based learning; MOOCs; more cognitive adaptive models; use of analytics to improve efficiency, student learning, time to degree, etc. A key recommendation here is to task experts to set a course for where we need to go with this.
 - d. E&E: Leverage buying power of USM in procurement, etc. Need to look at new areas beyond what we have been looking at and counting for the last few years.

Next steps include review of the five themes:

THEME 1: key theme is degree completion—28,000 degrees by 2020; the state plan says by 2025. We should align with the state, instead of our original projections.

Access: Baltimore initiatives; increase ways of saving; community college transfers; UMUC; invest in and incorporate analytics

THEME 2: Economic development: STEM, especially IT, computer science, engineering, and nursing.

THEME 3: Academic transformation: Work with the Kirwan center to develop priorities, vision, etc.

THEME 4: E&E: Incorporate recommendations of the E&E group. Include a new development goal as well as a focus on sustainability, including targeted greenhouse gas emissions

THEME 5: Supporting our people, facilities, and programs—focus on diversity and how it contributes to the system's success and state's success

We will look at responses to surveys to see what recommendations people have. We expect to have new subgoals in some areas. We will keep the goal of bringing faculty salaries to the 85th percentile.

Joann reported that this plan has been shared with shared governance groups across the system, and that we need to keep it at the level of talking about the shared issues across institutions.

Beth: Some faculty are not interested in online teaching. Is there something in the area of academic transformation for faculty who teach face-to-face, in terms of training, etc.

Joann talked about the importance of moving away from the "sage on the stage" approach. Academic transformation also includes stacking of credentials toward a bachelor's degree, addressing overall costs in higher education (perhaps by incorporating online education as a part of overall education). Other approaches include dual enrollment, transfer capabilities, and faculty development.

Albert: One slide relates to MOOCs. These are quite different from online courses. One intriguing idea might be to consider, in the framework of the strategic plan, students who want to take one online class and transfer it to other USM institutions.

Joann: We are now member of EdXn and we have one combined course on USMX as a model. Students may take it for free or may pay just a few dollars and receive a certificate, or pay a more substantial fee to obtain credit for the course.

1:35 Committees: Discussion Item – Making CUSF visible on campus

Suggestions included the following

- Email CUSF newsletters to faculty
- Regular attendance of CUSF representatives at faculty senate meetings

Albert: CUSF members at UMUC are now invited to AAB, but we have trouble because we do not have a campus location. We believe that the administration at UMUC does not want communication with faculty. So the person who controls the email list controls the communication, and that is the provost and she would not grant me access to the faculty email.

Robert suggested that Albert work with the AAB to work with the administration in regard to how to communicate with the faculty.

Nagaraj: At UMBC, there are no faculty who have access to full faculty email list. Senate has an executive committee (ex com), so we just send an email to senate chair to ask to be on the agenda. That leads to an invitation to the Senate ex com meeting, but I never make it to agenda.

Robert: At FSU, CUSF members sit on the Senate and on the Faculty Affairs committee.

Pete Herzfeld asked why different institutions have different policies on access to faculty email lists. At FSU, we may develop an extranet for different groups.

Ethan Kaplan: At UMCP, the faculty feel about CUSF the way they feel about the Senate, which is that it is powerless and they don't want anything to do with it. The Senate chair started using a message board for the Senate and I post CUSF notes there and it has generated some comment.

Robert closed this discussion with a reminder to focus on this at each campus.

Questions for the BOR:

From Faculty Affairs committee:

How are faculty involved in high-level searches/selections on campus?

Can/how can faculty have a say in which consulting firm will be hired?

Academic Affairs committee:

Is there a USM policy of faculty accountability?

Policy 1.25-134?

Should we create standards?

We also need to reexamine technology policies.

Legislative affairs committee:

Still working on questions for BOR.

Membership and Rules committee:

On reapportionment, we need to wait for final numbers in December to make a final decision.

1:51 Action and Information Items:

AI-1601: Mission, Vision, Goals, and Strategic Plan – Robert Kauffman

Two motions from ExCom:

- **MOTION: Approve the mission & vision statement for one year** (October 17). We will review the statement again in April or May to revise it for next year. It is important that it align with the USM strategic plan revision. **Passes**
- **MOTION: Approve the Strategic Plan for one year** (October 2017). **Passes**

AI-1602: Logo – Julie Simon. See above

INFO: USM's new logo (see also: <http://www.usmd.edu/usm/logo/>). See above

AI-1603: Reapportionment – Bill Chapin—See above

AI-1604: Regent's Awards – Jay Zimmerman—NO REPORT

INFO: Chair's Report: Final report on STEM minority pipeline: grant to USM in Prince George's County to improve involvement in STEM of students. Very successful. Use powerpoint if applicable. Contact Nancy Shapiro at USM if interested.

INFO: Chancellor's Council Report for October 3rd Meeting [see page 38]

INFO: BOR Report for October 21st Meeting [see page 40]

INFO: USM P-20 National Science Foundation Math Science Partnership Grant: Final Report Minority Pipeline (see also summary under Chair's Report) [see page 42]

1:55 Old Business/New Business

Nagaraj: Legislative affairs: New wording of collective bargaining agreement—**Motion was presented from committee; seconded; discussion:**

Joann: It is important that this group have an understanding as to what the next steps would be. To whom do you wish to present it and what do you expect the outcome to be?

Albert: Robert Kauffman reports to BOR that we expect that the BOR support the legalization of the right.

Ethan: Therefore, the employees would be permitted to make the decision, rather than have the decision that was made at the BOR or USM level bar us from having these rights.

Joann: Robert Kauffman will want to talk to Joe Vivona at USM.

Chris Brittan-Powell: This is a simple reassertion of what we have stated for years at CUSF.

Joann: USM is considered unique from other state-level departments.

Bill Chapin: Early on agenda of November meeting? (MOTION)

Robert: **Motion to table; second; passed.**

2:09 Adjournment

Dial-in Number 712.775.7031 – Conference ID 986-875-588

CUSF website: <http://ww.usmd.edu/usm/workgroups/SystemFaculty/>

Schedule of Future CUSF Meetings		
Month	Schedule of CUSF Council Meetings for 2016-2017 Academic Year	Location
November	Friday, Nov 18, 2016 (joint Councils)	UMCP
December	Thursday, Dec 8, 2016	CSU
January	Wednesday, Jan 18, 2017	USM, Adelphi
February	Thursday, Feb 16, 2017	UB
March	Wednesday, March 15, 2017	UMUC
April	Thursday, April 20, 2017	TU
May	Monday, May 15, 2017	UMBC
June	Tuesday, June 13, 2017 (optional)	USM, Adelphi