



COUNCIL of UNIVERSITY
SYSTEM FACULTY

CUSF MEETING

USM office

Adelphi, Maryland

Wednesday, January 18, 2016 10:00 a.m.

Minutes

ATTENDANCE:

Bowie (2)	Benjamin Arah, Patricia Westerman
Coppin (2)	Virletta Bryant, Chris Brittan-Powell,
Frostburg (3)	Robert Kauffman
Salisbury (3)	Dave Parker
Towson (4)	Beth Clifford, Raj Kolagani, Jay Zimmerman
UB (2)	Julie Simon
UMB (5)	Karen Clark (by phone)
UMBC (3)	Nagaraj Neerchal, James Stephens
UMCES (2)	Dave Secor
UMCP (6)	Ethan Kaplan, Madlen Simon
UMES (2)	Bill Chapin
UMUC (3)	Elizabeth Brunn, Sabrina Fu (by phone), David Hershfield, Albert Nekimken
USM	Joann Boughman, Zakiya Lee Andy Clark, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Government Relations
Guests	Charles Thomas, Executive Director of the USMAI Patrick Dawson, Dir., UMBC library Autumn Reed, UMBC

10:01—Call to order

Robert Kauffman called the meeting to order.

10:02 Minutes of December 8, 2016 CUSF meeting

Motion was made and seconded. Minutes were approved with amendments.

10:04 Report from USM—Joann Boughman

Governor released his budget this week. More later.

The Board of Regents (BOR) are moving to "consent agendas" for full BOR meetings. Committees do much of the work, whereas the full BOR meeting is perfunctory in providing approval, etc. Often, questions are around workforce needs, how it relates to individual campus constituencies, etc. All of that means that a consent agenda will be used instead, rather than review the work of each committee. This will leave more time for discussion. For the February BOR meeting, the main topic is freedom of speech/first amendment.

There was a panel at Education Policy & Student Life (EPSL) Committee discussing student life and some challenges therein on campuses, including where free speech ends and hate speech starts. The discussion included what kinds of speech will require a response from campus administrators. It appears that the campuses are paying a lot of attention to this issue and to issues of student activism. Discussion focused also on seeing students as clients versus customers versus just students at various times. There was also discussion about whether to attend primarily to declarations made by elected student leaders or to groups of students who come together to address a perceived problem. It is important to maintain a balance between duly elected governance groups versus outside groups that tend, at times, to attract greater attention.

RK: The panel discussion was very good. Takeaways were that activists were not typical student leaders as well as the impact of social media. I believe that the consent agenda will permit more discussion and communication.

Ethan: In our building, a white nationalist group's speech included talking about certain groups of people who need to be gotten rid of. This I believe would be hate speech. On the other hand, a Palestinian group has been disallowed because it was seen as engaging in hate speech, when they were simply taking issue with the Nation of Israel.

Joann: Discussion at the next BOR will relate to whether campuses have policies, and whether the BOR needs to develop policies about this issue. The faculty need to manage this matter in the classrooms. This raises issues of trigger warnings, safe spaces, etc. If you in CUSF or in other faculty groups have ideas, please share.

Albert: Was there a distinction between public and private speech? For example, students on social media may engage in both types of speech.

Joann: We have some standing when students are using university-provided domains versus others. But also each institution needs to be monitoring twitter so as not to miss something important.

Beth C: How does the BOR view demands of the students?

Joann: Some of the students' demands, such as race-based scholarships, are illegal. Some are necessary changes that we know we need to work on. Some are not useful.

Raj: With regard to the boundary between free and hate speech, perhaps one could develop a matrix with criteria for each. While that's being developed, all constituents could have input to this.

Nagaraj: It's good to increase the number of people responding. Also, some Regents do not have education backgrounds. Finally, we need to be careful about using ideas such as "students as customers." Are students paying for grades or, from faculty perspective, are we delivering education?

Joann: You pay people to be in our business and there's control that you have over their behaviors. We are not paying students to be here, so students as customers fits better because they are paying us to deliver a service.

Elizabeth B: This highlights how UMUC is different. Our students are our paying customers and they are very vocal about that. These people are, in their minds, buying a degree. This has many ramifications including identifying what's important to them, minimal intellectual curiosity on behalf of students, etc.

Sabrina: We are, in fact, paid for providing professional assessment, not for grades. I don't see how UMUC is different. I tell my students all the time, "You are not paying to get a good grade." Part of our role is to tell students what academics is about.

Joann: The debate is even more complex than that because now we have discussion and debate about what the degree is actually all about; that is, is a college education about liberal arts education or is the purpose to put students on a career trajectory? And this is further complicated by the media whose marketing targets students who wish to earn degrees for the sole purpose of landing jobs.

Nagaraj: When I talk to recruiters, they want students to be trained in skills that they need for jobs. My reaction is that industry is changing, so my responsibility is to teach students how to learn, so they can be productive for the long term.

Chris: Yes, we need to teach students to think critically.

Julie: I just completed an employer survey, and prospective employers – at least in the digital communications field—want people who can write and people who can think about problems. But what I get from students is how to use photoshop. That's like my teaching you to use a pen. I've consistently received the same answers from employers.

Ethan: With regard to the boundary between free speech and hate speech, is there a role for CUSF to weigh in on that?

Joann: There may be. As the conversation goes forward, the question of whether we should develop more specific policies may arise, and we may bring this issue to CUSF.

Zakiya: There is an extremism policy.

Ethan: Would there perhaps be a work group?

Joann: Yes, including faculty and students. We need to make sure that responses are available for the times when they arise.

Robert: Going back to the consent agenda, this provides us with an opportunity to inform the regents; this is an important venue for us to talk about our perspectives on these matters. I'd like to see a group of Senate chairs or CUSF or other groups in there talking to them about their issues. This may allow us to try to help them develop a greater understanding of our important issues.

Joann: It may be helpful when the BOR meets on your campus to have the CUSF member(s) sit in on the discussion portion of the meeting.

Beth C: In light of educating regents, I was surprised at their level of understanding of issues of diversity. There appeared to be little understanding of institutional racism, intersectionality, etc.

Joann: Yes, they appear to have less developed views about some matters, including speech. And the faculty need to be prepared to handle situations that often tend to arise.

Jay: If people attend the BOR meetings, is the Board open to comments by people outside of you (Joann) or Robert?

Joann: I'm not sure because this is a new approach. I can't predict that, but it would be helpful for more than one or two people to hear the proceedings. The chairman of the BOR will attend the March CUSF meeting. We could ask him about how we could engage more directly with BOR (including in BOR meetings).

CUSF member by phone: Do they usually ask questions of you at the meetings?

Joann: At full BOR meeting, they often do not. But this will be a new process.

Albert: It appears difficult for someone to address a BOR committee. How is the agenda determined?

Joann: By committee chairs. They can call on whom they wish. The EPSL committee tends to be more open.

Raj: Regarding free/hate speech, there may be research in the social sciences about this. Would it make sense to find out what's in the literature about this?

Joann: The speaker at the meeting will be a personal knowledgeable about the topic, and this will provide context to begin the discussion. I'm trying to use EPSL group to inform the regents about what's happening on campuses.

Raj: CUSF reps, if permitted to attend BOR meeting and give feedback, can communicate about this with our campus faculty.

Robert: Going to the consent agenda permits us an opportunity to advocate for shared governance and about the role of the faculty. Re. Chairman Brady, he has consistently been very open, a good listener, and very outgoing; and that's to be commended.

Joann: And his overall commitment. We forget that regents are volunteers and they give two days per week on average to this work.

Nagaraj: Anything to report on Coalition case?

Joann: Absolutely nothing. The trial has started.

10:50—Open access-- Charles Thomas, Executive Director of the USMAI and Patrick Dawson, Dir., UMBC library

Charles: We are seeking endorsement from CUSF and later from student council and then the provosts for a motion that voted upon by CUSF excomm.

Patrick: The UMBC academic senate approved a motion to adopt an open access policy/process.

Chuck: Open access is probably familiar to most of you. In our context, it affords easier access by faculty and by students to one's research findings. Still, only 12% of peer-reviewed journals each year are made available through open access. The statement is not a mandate, but it would make us one of only a very small number of university systems to have an approved statement on open access. This statement is a tool to encourage at the institutional level for faculty, administration, students to discuss how to retain and exercise one's rights as an author, but to make scholarship accessible to all.

Raj: Open-access journals rely on author-paid fees in order to publish in those journals. The fees are sometimes waived. If publications were placed into open access, where is money coming from to pay for publication?

Jay: I just had something accepted; we had two options—open-access or traditional. If you want open-access, you pay 1500-2000 Euros up front. We did not take that route.

Nagaraj: When we make up a budget within a grant proposal that includes publication costs, it raises red flags.

Chuck: This is only asking faculty to consider their options. Some universities can and others cannot cover publication costs. Discussion could include how to pay for these things. Other activities for open access might include self-archiving on one's own or going through certain repositories.

Jay: Some journals require us to sign away full copyright. The statement says that you can negotiate. I don't know if we have time to do this.

Chuck: If you turn in an addendum with your contract, you retain your copyright. After the time period of the 6-month or 12-month embargo, you may place your research in the repository.

Laksmees: I'm a librarian at Towson. It is expensive to pay for this open access, but I second the idea of understanding the issue of copyright.

Karen: At least in health care, some open access journals in health care allow you to keep all rights. Some authors pay an upfront costs, others do not. Authors retain all rights.

CUSF Member: AAAS has weighed in on this. It is a very complex issue. I would have trouble endorsing this statement when so much is changing all the time. For providers of information, we want to encourage scholarship in the System, but this statement subjects our faculty to an uncertain future. I would encourage you to provide us with an information document on benefits and disadvantages of open access, rather than ask us for an encouragement/endorsement.

Chuck: Open access has been around for more than 20 years and has taken a strong foothold in some disciplines and not in others.

Patrick: We're not asking for a mandate; just encouragement of consideration.

Julie: So open access says that after journal embargo, my article becomes public, but I must pay for that.

Chuck: No, not true.

Jay: There is a concern about "predatory" journals. But we can consult Beal's list, which is a list of predatory editors.

Chuck: This is one part of open access. There are 28,000 peer-reviewed English language journals and 7000 non-English language journals that are not predatory. Beal's list has predatory journals with low standards. About 1200 predatory journals appear on that list.

Joann: The library consortium has come forward and determined that it is time, as a consortium, to bring these issues directly to the faculty and students of the system. The wording we can discuss, but what the librarians are telling us is that authors should become educated about this issue and learn about how to determine how wide their audience would be, learn about journals that require or do not require payment, etc. If everyone would want to go open access if money were not an issue, then we can work with provosts to find funds to support this activity.

Ethan: I come from a discipline with no highly-ranked open access journals. Also, we tend to publish our own articles on our websites, and we've never been sued. In economics, you're not going to get tenure if you publish in open access journals. Because universities are cash-strapped, we're looking at repealing the ban on restricted research (i.e., you do work for military or private industry and then they retain ownership of your work) to increase funding.

Raj: Journals have impact factors, which are useful in tenure and promotion decisions. Open access increases citation of one's work, so impact increases.

Dave S: It's not just about money, but about quality.

Chris: Any ideas about how the legislature may see this? Would they perhaps offer funding for this?

Joann: Will be very much for (open educational resources (OER) on behalf of the students but not for open access (OA).

Raj: How are mandated university systems funding this?

Chuck: In California, they assert the right to make copy available through state-funded repositories to distribute freely. Many state universities use their own funds to support this, but it can be substantial.

Jay: You are trying to change the culture of the publishing industry. Publishers make money by charging library's money for journals. Want to shift the funding mechanism from library paying to faculty paying.

Patrick: We're talking about making what's produced by USM faculty available worldwide.

Bill: Every time we have a cut in funding, the first place that gets attacked is the library. We are poor now. What is the economic model? The money for this will not come from USM. Our institutions will have to pay for this.

Joann: This statement **asks only to encourage consideration of open access**. This would have to be followed up by having CUSF members and Faculty Senators discuss the matter on their campuses.

MOTION:

"MOTION: Be it resolved that the Council of University System Faculty (CUSF) endorses the 'Statement Supporting Open Access Dissemination of Scholarship' advanced by the USM Library Consortium."

Statement

"We encourage the faculty, researchers, and students within USM institutions to consider Open Access dissemination of their research and other scholarly works. Open Access dissemination may include activities such as:

- publishing in high-quality peer-reviewed journals supportive of Open Access;
- retaining and exercising individual authors' rights to deposit appropriate versions of their research articles and other scholarly works into openly accessible disciplinary or institutional digital repositories.

We also encourage all USM institutions to review existing local policies and practices to ensure faculty, researchers, and students who choose to provide Open Access to their research and other scholarly works are appropriately supported and accommodated. More guidance on implementing institutional support for Open Access is available through resources such as the guide, Good Practices for University Open-Access Policies."

In favor—10

Opposed—4

Abstentions—6

Robert breaks tie by voting in favor.

Motion passes.

Nagaraj: Faculty should be aware of tenure-related standards of their disciplines. Also, pay charges are not only required by open-access journals, but by some others as well.

11:40—Update on Legislative Session--Andy Clark, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Government Relations.

Operating and capital budgets were released today as well as the budget reconciliation and finance act (BRFA). I can't access the budget online, but I'll provide the information on Friday in the legislative newsletter. I expect a flat budget. We have a \$500 million deficit. The governor wishes to build up the rainy day fund. We have to defend the governor's budget because legislature can cut, but cannot add to the governor's budget, which includes:

- \$17.5m for tuition buy-down (from 4% to 2%)
- 100% interest deduction on student loan debt
- \$380 million in capital construction requests for USM, which is \$100 million more than we requested last year

On the national level, the Education Secretary designee does not appear to be knowledgeable about higher education. There is greater access, therefore, for higher education chancellors and presidents to the new administration.

Chris' list of issues consists of bills in the categories of the 4Cs:

- Cost
- Completion
- Crime
- Culture

Andy: We have perennial bills in Annapolis this year—disciplinary notations on transcripts (related to sexual assault); weapons ban on campus (with amendments); textbook affordability; etc.

February 3 is the deadline to introduce a bill. There is only one new state higher education bill introduced thus far: On the federal level, the IRS allows you to use retirement funds for qualified educational expenses without penalty. They want to have this on state level as well. In Annapolis, we get together every Friday with the state government relations council. If you don't know who your campus lobbyist is, ask me or your administration. This person is a good source for information.

We have phone conference calls on Mondays at 9:30 a.m. I'll send the phone number out through CUSF. You are welcome to join us.

The end of session is April 10.

Robert: What are the ground rules on the conference call?

Chris: Andy is very amenable, but he keeps us on track. The phone conference is very helpful to listen in on. Reading the Friday newsletter before attending phone call is also helpful.

Committees will be briefed on how much revenue there is. The March revenue report determines whether there's any money for a supplemental budget. The higher education overview (MHEC overview) is January 26 at 1 pm (Andy will verify this). Individual campus budget hearings take place either every year or every other year for each campus.

CUSF/CUSS/ Student council advocacy day is February 28.

Albert: How many new faces?

Andy: Three members have jumped to the Senate. There are a couple vacancies now in the House, and there may be a few more vacancies related to problems on the PG County liquor board. There are five new faces in the House because of retirements and resignations.

The turnover in 2018 will probably be pretty high; it is usually around 40 to 45%.

Chris How do you see decision making by the governor and the legislature playing out with regard to higher education?

Andy: Under O'Malley and Hogan, we're treated fairly by the governor and the legislature. Our budget sticks out like a sore thumb because it's a big budget because we do a lot of things, but we've grown by 30,000 students in the last 10 years.

CBP: Economic development components?

Andy: They grow if there's a supplemental budget.

Joann: When you read about USM initiatives on economic development, we are repackaging what we already do. We are NOT shifting from an educating mission to a training mission. USM is one of the largest economic engines of the state.

CBP: With the encouragement of research collaborations within communities, is there a big push to change/affect curricula?

Joann: Not from the outside. From the inside, some disciplines are recognizing that certain credentials are especially useful.

CBP: Workload question?

Joann: This year's workload report's message is that we have more students; and more students graduating; more students graduating in workforce areas of high need; and we are doing it without expanding state-based budget; and our students are completing degrees more quickly; and we are doing this with more diverse students.

Albert: Are community colleges included?

Andy: Community colleges get money based on the Cade formula related to USM budget.

Chris: How does BCCC's being a state institution relate to all this?

Andy: No idea. The idea that USM would take over BCCC is not going to happen. There are partnership opportunities that are really promising. It's being run by the state, and some people see this as a problem.

Robert: You'll send us the phone number and the newsletter.

12:13 Chair's report—Robert Kauffman

The report includes commentary on calculation of FT faculty as System does it. The categories have changed—there are now four—and MHEC has changed the classification schemes.

Commentary 2 involves reapportionment: UMB gains 1; UMUC loses 1.

Commentary 3: Jordan Goodman, Faculty Senate Chair from UMCP talked about Slack—a social media platform as a way to increase collaboration among CUSF members between meetings. The Faculty Affairs committee may wish to discuss this.

Academic Affairs may want to discuss Bobbi Adams' concern regarding textbook legislation and not enough lead time to make textbook decisions.

12:20 Lunch

12:45 Reconvene for committee reports

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS— Chris talked about planning for Annapolis day, February 28.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS— Julie Simon reported that her committee is looking into:

- 6 months ahead requirement for textbooks
- Consistent with E&E 2.0—use System to bulk-buy software—need the name of the contact person

FACULTY AFFAIRS—Raj reported that the committee is interested in looking into Slack. Someone would have to be responsible for setting it up and for making changes as CUSF membership changes.

Jay: CUSF meetings are open, and this would constitute a meeting, so we would have to leave it open to all.

Raj: Instead of thinking of it as a meeting, it's more like an email. The analogy is that when Bob send us an email, this is not a meeting.

Ethan: Jordan is my senate chair. Legally, this does not constitute a meeting. The only critical issue is that communications are subject to FOIA requests.

Robert: I'll check this with Joann.

Raj: The secretary would have to update this roster each year.

Robert: Let's start thinking about this, talking about it, and so forth.

1:01 Dr. Autumn Reed--UMBC

See powerpoint emailed by Zakiya

STRIDE is an approach to help the faculty to recruit, retain, and advance underrepresented minority faculty and women faculty in STEM disciplines at UMBC. The approach includes thinking through where to advertise positions to increase initiatives; developing and sustaining relationships with underrepresented groups; and other critical steps.

This effort arose from an appreciation that, because of implicit bias, faculty searches weren't uniformly happening across campus. Autumn was charged with reviewing best practices. She decided to develop and implement an approach based partly on a peer-education model from the University of Michigan.

The URM executive committee voted to use this model at UMBC and Autumn Reed was elected as the director of the initiative.

Michigan advised us not to choose faculty from majority groups because we didn't want this to turn into a greater burden for minority faculty. Also, because trying to engage majority faculty, asking majority faculty to be on the team, appeared to be a good start for this process.

Autumn chose faculty with a demonstrated commitment to diversity.

The group started also by defining diversity as critical diversity, which especially draws attention to groups that have been historically excluded. This definition allows departments and units to think about what types of diversity would be beneficial within their areas.

Instead of a 2-hour workshop (as was done at Michigan), the group decided on focused conversations so that the process would be participatory.

Slide 10 identifies the life cycle of the search

1. review and revise position descriptions and job advertisements—some seeded with inclusive language, some without
2. These criteria should match
3. A two-act play was acted out by the STRIDE committee, critiqued by the audience
4. Scheduled for April 2017

Consultations were offered by the group to any department. Examples were developed about what approaches would be most fruitful in different disciplines.

STRIDE does encounter resistance, but there are also great a-ha moments.

The group demonstrates show how pre-thought and pre-planning and make this process work better.

Finally, there are regular lunches in which groups of faculty learn from each other, hear about the issues, hear questions from faculty about why we're doing this, etc.

Next steps will include thinking more about retention; thinking about departmental culture; expanding the team; being critically self-reflective on our work; etc.

Albert: How much pushback from White males?

Autumn: We didn't get that pushback specifically. Because we had an effort already in place, it helped. I don't see a level of hostility. The approach we take is that you need to assemble the most diverse *pool* as possible, then choose the best applicant.

Nagaraj: One a-ha moment within our department: Sometimes we say we were looking for someone in a particular area within math. If you do that, the best people in that specified area are going to be a very small set. In thinking of diversity, we decided to recruit (a) to fill the position and (b) to increase diversity. We learned that we needed to be more flexible in the breadth of the subdiscipline area, and this allowed us to diversify our pool.

1:30—Action items—Robert Kauffman

--Reapportionment: 1 CUSF representative is added at UMB, and 1 is subtracted from UMUC.

--Regents' Faculty Awards:

Jay: We met and sent forward our recommendations.

Discussion related to misconceptions about how many candidates could be sent from one campus; process of review; etc.

Zakiya referred us to the document explaining objectives, processes, etc. for the awards.

Questions arose as to whether dollar amount of each award could be increased.

Joann responded that we would, then, have to decrease the number of awards. CUSS is also discussing this issue.

Virletta (and others agreed): There is a concern that smaller institutions are at a disadvantage.

Raj: Perhaps there should be a subcommittee for each type of award.

Robert: We will discuss these ideas further at excomm.

Robert and CUSF members expressed appreciation to Jay and his group for their hard work in evaluating candidates.

Jay reminded that we said we would elect an awards committee chair in April.

Zakiya asked Robert to email policies to CUSF representatives before the next meeting.

Robert agreed.

-Maryland State Plan for Post-secondary Education (2017-2021):

Virletta: MHEC is working to develop its goals and will complete this process in March.

Robert and CUSF members thanked Virletta for representing CUSF on this board.

--Robert will add textbook and Slack items to list of action items for next meeting.

2:08 Adjourned.

Month	Schedule of CUSF Council Meetings for 2016-2017 Academic	Location
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