



COUNCIL of UNIVERSITY  
SYSTEM FACULTY

**Minutes of CUSF meeting**  
*University of Baltimore*  
*Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:00 a.m.*

**ATTENDANCE:**

Bowie (2)	Patricia Westerman
Coppin (2)	Chris Brittan-Powell
Frostburg (3)	Kelly Hall (by phone), Pete Herzfeld, Robert Kauffman,
Salisbury (3)	Bobbi Adams, Dave Parker
Towson (4)	Beth Clifford, Ryan King-White, Raj Kolagani, Jay Zimmerman
UB (2)	Stephanie Gibson, Julie Simon, Jessica Sowa
UMB (5)	Isabel Rambob
UMBC (3)	Nagaraj Neerchal, James Stephens, Lina Zhou
UMCES (2)	
UMCP (6)	Ethan Kaplan
UMES (2)	Bill Chapin, Robert Johnson
UMUC (3)	Elizabeth Brunn, Sabrina Fu, David Hershfield, Albert Nekimken
USM	Joann Boughman, Zakiya Lee
Guests	Jim Brady, BOR Chair Darlene Brannigan Smith, UB Provost JC Weiss, UB Faculty Senate Chair

## **10:00—Call to order**

Robert Kauffman called the meeting to order.

## **10:01 Welcome from Provost Smith**

## **10:17 Report from Faculty Senate—JC Weiss**

JC: We used to have two university-wide shared governance bodies. It didn't work well. Now each School has its own shared governance, then it's fed up to the institution level. About a year ago, we decided to assess what we'd been doing. It was working okay, but we wanted to make changes. We're not changing the governance structure, but tightening up (1) communication and (2) accountability. We also reviewed university-level committees, including determining which departments really needed to be engaged on certain committees, and we added accountability to the process, too. We think this will rectify less productive areas.

We also scanned other universities' processes of strategic planning and budgeting. Now we have, for the first time, a Strategic Planning and Budgeting committee. It's been heartening. The collegiality, the energy has been wonderful. The process is not final. We'll make changes as we go. We had Jim Brady, BOR chair, at our second meeting. He advised us to be bold, which is tough to do.

All in all, the state of shared governance is collegial, productive, and communicative; and we have an administration that listens.

Albert Nekimken: What are the boundaries of the faculty senate, on the inside versus the outside?

JC: We deal primarily with academic issues. We're moving more to having a voice on budget and on policy issues.

We also have a staff senate and student government association. We have a steering council-- with leadership from each of the 3 entities-- that meets monthly.

Provost Smith: We use governance as an opportunity for listening, for collaboration; and we try not to put boxes around things. It facilitates both structure and communication.

Albert: Are there turf wars because of the School-level governance groups?

Provost Smith: It can reinforce silos, but we have to work intentionally against that.

JC: The executive committee of the University Senate meets once a month so we can have confidential information sharing. And this feeds back to School Senates.

Stephanie Gibson: School senates are senates of the whole, no representatives. They're really just faculty meetings.

Sabrina Fu: Do you have any best practices that have brought about the collaborative engagement?

JC: 1. We communicate about when meetings are; 2. We serve lunch; and 3. We hold meetings in rooms that are large enough to accommodate people. This all makes the meetings very welcoming.

Steph: People come to the meetings because this is where they can find out what's happening on campus.

Provost Smith: We've worked really hard to establish trust, and to communicate that we're all working toward common goals.

Jo: Nationally, there's a phrase: If the USM can make it work, anybody ought to be able to make it work. This is because USM is one of the most diverse systems. And UB is also diverse in a number of ways and they make it work. So any of us as individual institutions can make it work.

### **10:31 Approval of January 2017 CUSF meeting minutes**

Minutes from last meeting: No revisions. Motion. Second.

Approved.

### **10:33 Report from USM**

Jo: We are in legislative session. We are facing uphill challenges this year with the budget, which is very tight. We are working hard to maintain the needed level of budget. The midyear cut will be maintained.

Higher Ed Initiative Fund (HEIF)—We were supposed to get money from the interest of this fund. The fund did not do well so we will not get the expected money.

There will be no Cola and no Merit for any state employees.

Sixteen hundred bills have been dropped, of which we're working on and testifying before legislators about more than 80. These center around issues such as financial aid, admission processes, etc.

This week, mostly administrative people are testifying, but we are pulling from the campuses for people to give testimony.

I'd like to provide a heads-up about policies: All policies are under a review cycle. These four will come to CUSF for your examination.

1. Nondiscrimination/equal opportunity issues

2. Family medical leave (FMLA): We need to meet changes in federal law since these policies were last reviewed.

3. Parental leave: same as above

I would like to have two to three CUSF reps sit with us to look at items 2 and 3 before bringing them to CUSF. We know, for example, in FMLA, that we need to include military leave.

Stephanie Gibson, Jay Zimmerman, and Bobbi Adams will serve.

4. Honorary degree policy: This will be at the BOR Friday. We have historically not provided honorary degrees to sitting officials in Maryland. We changed it to elected/appointed persons period.

Re. 4: We are encouraging that not all commencement speakers need to receive honorary degrees. Other honors may be given instead.

Albert: How many bills are usually passed?

Jo: I don't know.

Stephanie: Usually one major education bill per session is passed.

Jay: Any particular one that we're very worried about?

Jo: The ban the box bill, to remove the question on admissions form "Have you been convicted of a felony?" The common app federally has that, and we have no control over that. Also, checking the box does not disqualify the individual; it triggers a process on campus to determine whether the person is ready for college, if support services are available for the person, etc. We get concerned because the bill may wreak havoc on our processes. Also, we are following federal and state and BOR guidelines/policies. To insert new laws, especially if vague or poorly-worded, puts us in chaotic situations. We remind the legislators, for example, that legislators should not be setting curricula for the campuses (e.g., mandatory credit hours for opiate education). This is not appropriate, and it would cause trouble with our accrediting bodies.

Bobbi Adams: What about ban the box for student housing?

Jo: We spent a lot of time talking about student housing. And we talked about the necessity of keeping individuals with felony records from applying to pharmacy, law, etc. because they can't get licensed in these areas with felony records.

Nagaraj Neerchal: Will there be enhancement funds?

Jo: It looks as though there will be none. Last year's bill 1082 regarding funding guidelines is not on the table. We're working hard to put it back on the table.

Nagaraj: Is it tabled for next year or completely off the table?

Jo: We don't know. It normally has to go into the governor's budget the following year, which would be this year, but it didn't happen, even though the legislature passed the bill last year.

Jim Brady: The governor has been very supportive of higher education, but every budget year is a new year.

Jay: Any word on the ART policy revision?

Jo: We'll have a meeting on it soon.

### **10:54 Chair's report**

First, commentary—Virletta Bryant has gone on to a new job. Beth is passing around a card. Please sign, if you wish.

Second, regarding reconsideration of the textbook lead time item. The executive committee recommends sending this to the ?? committee for consideration. If we pursue this, we would need to get the endorsement of students because the textbook law was passed for the benefit of the students.

Bobbi: That law doesn't actually keep the cost of textbooks down. Second, our bookstore now has an affordability meter. They're pushing us to use used books because they make more money on used books.

Robert: I will remand this to the ?? Committee.

Third, we are pleased to have BOR Chairman Brady with us today. The chancellor will join us for the May meeting. When he comes, he talks about information of what's happening inside the system. The regents are at the 30,000-foot level, so I've had to switch my perspective. Instead of our drilling him with questions, I'd like for him to listen to what's occurring on the campuses, which provides him with valuable input. He is focused primarily on freedom of speech, so I'd like to start our discussion on that issue: free speech in classroom and on campuses.

### **11:01 BOR Chair Jim Brady**

Jim: Yes, the regents operate at 30,000 feet, but we have the same objectives that you all have: to provide young people with education that will permit them to live productive lives. Faculty have a greater role in this. Also, I'm not here to lecture you. It's all about dialog.

Dialog has become something of a lost art in society today. We are too commonly seeing monologues. Listening is a necessary part of a dialog. And I want this to be a continuous dialog.

The challenges facing higher education are significant, important, and should cause us to think through how we are presenting what we do. I have a few areas about which I would like to talk with you today:

1. "The value proposition:" A new concept. Is higher education valuable?

What is the role of the university in our future? Should it change, versus be true to its roots—a challenging environment where ideas are debated civilly, where students are exposed to a wide range of views? Forces have challenged the traditional point of view. We have to deal with parents who have opinions that colleges are there to get my children off my payroll. This is not a crazy notion, but it was never what I thought higher education was there for. We need to do a better job of restating the value proposition of higher education: it is about preparing young people for the rest of their lives.

I was an accounting major at a liberal arts college—4 years of philosophy, 3 years of French, 4 years of history, etc. For the first 3 years in my career, I knew the latest in accounting. After that, it was this other preparation that allowed me to think in a way that I could communicate well, deal with different kinds of people, etc. A balanced education with technical things and liberal arts is essential. This is not a popular concept these days, but we're the only ones to make that case. We need to be clear about our objectives, how we measure success. The idea that students should determine what they are taught is crazy; it is up to us to determine this so that they can accomplish the objective of learning how to deal with a very complex world—where there are no safe places; where people are going to offend—and help them learn how to deal with and respond to that. We need to prepare them to deal with the real world, not Fantasy Island. We are meant to challenge; students should not be totally comfortable for four years. We can challenge in a civil way.

2. Cost-benefit relationship: applied to higher education in a relatively unique way

3. Shared governance: There is no common definition. This is one of the most confused concepts out there. Clarity is important.

4. Academic freedom: This is essential. It's what universities are all about, and it is assaulted on a regular basis.

5. Inclusion/diversity: What is challenging is creating an environment where people can thrive. We need to create a receptive, welcoming environment.

Elizabeth Brunn: In order to define the role of universities in 21<sup>st</sup> century, we need to define the student of 21<sup>st</sup> C. We don't have only young people. We are going into community colleges and high schools now offering pipelines from high school through community college to UMUC and to graduation for \$9000.00 That's going to turn us upside down. UB has a growing number of

military people as students. We're all getting a lot more adult learners. Do we need to change the way we deliver? Yes, and it must start with description of the student we are engaging.

Jim: There is no question that the student today is different from the students when I went to school. But that doesn't change the ultimate goal of making sure we prepare students for real world.

Elizabeth: Adult students go to college with the expectation that they'll leave with a degree and get a job that earns them more money than they're making now. The traditional student is there for self-discovery.

Jim: I think traditional aged students are also focused on getting jobs. But we still have an obligation to prepare people for a more and more challenging world.

Beth Clifford: I'm familiar with the criticism of safe spaces. I think sometimes that criticism is based on a misunderstanding. The way we operate is that it is a space where you will not be exposed to racism/sexism/homophobia. How do you reconcile making schools more inclusive, if that kind of safe space is not important? If you have a diverse student body and we do not ensure that discrimination will not be tolerated, then students in these groups will have an inferior educational experience.

Jim: The definition of safe space has been exaggerated. The idea that campuses should not tolerate racism, of course, is true. It has been taken well beyond that. The term "safe space" has become misdefined. "Hate speech," for example, is not having someone challenge your point of view, sometimes in a very forceful way. When you get into racism, sexism, etc., they're not that hard to identify.

Beth: When students are exposed to microaggressions, it can be very damaging to them.

Jim: This is not the same as challenging one's position. The term "safe space" is overly simplistic. You mentioned some issues of speakers invited to campus. To me, the most offensive is Rutgers and Condoleezza Rice—you can disagree with her, but for her not to be allowed to come to campus to speak would be anathema.

David Parker: Thank you. One of the most elegant presentations of what a higher education institution is supposed to be about. Where did you go to school?

Jim: Iona

Dave: I went to a land-grant for engineering and I was required to take liberal arts courses. I tell my students that my job is to upset you, not to keep you complacent. That is the purpose. I always liked Berkeley. But with the riots to keep someone off campus, Berkeley is lost. We should hear people we disagree with, and then engage with/argue with them.

Bill Chapin: At an HBI, we are receiving students who are not really prepared for college. And much of the reason is because of the numbers: We hear praise for a principal who has gotten 2% more of her students into college. We are talking about *how many* students are retained, etc.; we don't talk about *what* they are learning. How do we deal with this underpreparedness?

Jim: I wish I had the magic elixir to solve that problem. I take an interest in the P-20 approach because it gets to that issue. There's nothing government can do to fix that. It has to start earlier, with families, elementary schools, etc. I remember having to work very hard to get through elementary and high school. The people in charge made a decision one month into high school about what Jim Brady was capable of, and it was very challenging. I worked harder in high school than in college. So I was very prepared for college-level work.

Ethan Kaplan: I'm an economics professor. One course I teach is on economic inequality, and we deal with certain parts of US history dealing with race. I've never had a problem with students feeling unsafe, etc. There may be an exaggeration of the notion that there's restricted speech on college campuses. I don't have a problem with Berkeley protesting Yannopoulos—he says incredibly harmful things. I am more troubled about, in terms of free speech, universities reaching out to new funding sources, especially for politically-tinged money. We got a \$5.5 million grant from a staunch libertarian and \$1.5 million more from the Koch foundation. The first person they hired was someone from a far-right society. And they admitted they restricted their search to people of libertarian political viewpoints. This is wrong.

Jim: I agree. To make hiring decisions based upon political ideology is foreign to what college campuses are supposed to be.

Jay: Students' speech is suppressed, unless they have a liberal point of view.

Jim: I agree, but I think our students have to be a lot tougher. I am tired of people who are offended. Don't be offended; take it on, challenge it.

Bobbi: On that point, one student was offended that some students agreed with "building the wall." I encouraged her to see it as a policy thing and to discuss it.

On the first thing you said, if we are seeking a diverse student body, I think we need to make nontraditional age students more welcome and to allow them to help, as they seem to be more focused, as leaders in the classroom and on campus.

Jim: We need to think about how we do that.

Bobbi: Also, I went to a liberal arts college, we shouldn't allow students to tell us what they need to know. The consumer model allows them to do that. Because of my education, a lot of the students studied philosophy and then went on to be bankers or to work at Apple. Teaching students how to think is the important thing, because there will be many changes in what they need to do in the workplace.



Nagaraj: Our role as faculty is to teach them how to think. We cannot see students as customers. It sends the wrong message, that is, that students think they can pay tuition and get their grades as a result of the money.

Jim: This is exactly the wrong message. They're students, not customers. And the faculty are the bosses.

Nagaraj: If you like me too much, I'm not pushing you enough. One thing that happens at the ground level is that faculty are being evaluated by students, and these evaluations are part of the ART review process.

Robert Johnson: Parents look at it as students as clients or customers. I've never seen so many lawmakers and leaders talk so much about rising costs of higher education. Nobody is helping the general public to understand this. This is an opportunity to educate the public to see the cost of higher education as a long-term investment. We need to invest in faculty salaries to retain excellent faculty.

Jim: I agree. Exactly on target. It's up to us to state the value of higher education. We have been too defensive and reluctant to make this case. An analogy would be McCormick Spice Company. It was, at one time, attacked for the spices' being too expensive. McCormick went on a campaign to explain their value. We have to do that. We need to play offense and not defense on this.

Albert: Thank you. This is an extremely positive opportunity. We have discussed the value of the humanities. To what extent are employers willing to pay for this type of education, instead of just for a stack of certificates?

Jim: They value those "soft" skills very highly. A frustration that companies have is they get students who can't communicate well. In some cases, those technical skills might be more important up-front, but very often the thinking and communication skills are much more important.

Albert: Yes. Also, we've heard predictions that state higher education will no longer exist in 20 years, given current funding levels. Also, as a result of funding issues, schools are being pressured to use more adjuncts. Have the regents discussed a desired ratio of tenured versus adjunct faculty?

Jim: We discuss this on campuses all the time. We value both full-time tenured faculty and adjuncts. We need a core group of tenured faculty; but it's also important to have qualified adjuncts.

In terms of funding, if we get to a place where state funding is not available, we are in deep trouble. So we work to ensure that legislators know the value of public higher education, that public higher education is a real difference maker.

12:05 LUNCH BREAK

Robert: It's now 12:00, let's take about 10 minutes to get lunch and then continue our discussion.

12:22 Discussion with BOR Chair Jim Brady (continued)

Jay: As a follow-up on the comment on adjuncts: The larger the number of adjuncts coming in, the greater the workload the tenured faculty have to do to make sure that the quality of education remains high. And most adjuncts are not doing the service load, so tenured faculty have to pick up these loads, too.

Isobel: How do we create these environments on campus in which students from diverse backgrounds can thrive, and how do we hold administrators to account for maintaining this environment?

Jim: I'm not sure, but the answer is not just about making speeches. It's about creating opportunities on the campuses for meaningful dialog. We need to get groups together that are not usually communicating, and have them speak frankly and develop trust in each other. Also, I have always been a fan of managing by walking around, rather than sitting in one's office and sending out dicta. The way to develop trust is to meet people in their own space. If we start with the notion that we have to do everything we can to create a more trusting environment, it would go a long way. And to all of you, I say that you represent what higher education is all about; you are the ones who impact students on a daily basis. It's our job on the BOR to empower you to make your impact as pervasive and as positive as it can be. You all have to understand how important you are and how empowered you should be in making your case known.

Inclusion is similar to shared governance in that there is no shared definition of it. If I gave all of you a test and asked you to write a paragraph of no more than five sentences about it, I think you'd find many different ways to express it. And that concept needs to be articulated better. Faculty ought to have incredible impact on curriculum. Beyond that is where the squishiness comes in.

Raj Kolagani: I appreciate the point of view that students must be tough. However, taken to an extreme, when there is a majority group and a minority group, then the voice of the minority will not be heard because of the greater volume of the majority. The members of the minority group may feel suppressed. Also, microaggression is real. Being a woman in a field in which women are rare, I noticed late in my life that microaggression does happen; for example, words used to describe me are different from those used for my male colleagues.

Jim: I understand. Let's take your first situation where one is in a clear minority, is there no vehicle at your university for you to use to combat that?

Raj: Yes. Our upper administration is very good. But at lower levels of administration, there is not the same level of respect.

Jim: I understand the idea that you don't want to be viewed as a trouble maker, but there are ways to make one's point that would not make one be perceived that way. And we talk about the merits of a multicultural environment, but we see that there can be problems as well. There must be vehicles on campus that allow you to raise issues without being called a trouble maker. How do we take advantage of increasing diversity? It's up to the universities to have mechanisms in place to make things better in light of increasing diversity.

And to get back to my earlier notion, it's all about trust. If trust exists in that place, you would have no difficulty raising alternate opinions.

Nagaraj: If someone is going through, e.g., a tenure process, there is a time and place at which one can bring up the issues, i.e., the possible injustices.

Jim: One of criticisms I would make about higher education in general is the notion that we are so different from everybody else. These issues about points of view exist in all aspects of society.

Chris Brittan-Powell: In looking over your five topics, I noted the liberal arts versus professional school models of higher education. One issue that is related is that of political correctness. From a liberal arts perspective, multiculturalism enhances all of our thinking. But what is the thinking at the 30,000-foot level, and in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, what is your sense of why we are where we are? And why, for example, are HBIs struggling so much?

Jim: My philosophy on HBIs is that I am a very strong supporter and I believe that the institutions should keep the terms, in light of their history. The HBIs have not been forceful enough in attempts to diversify.

Chris: Do you think it means an inferior education in people's minds?

Jim: No. Some of the finest institutions in the history of this country have been HBIs.

Chris: I agree. And we have an interesting case study of UB versus Coppin. Fifty years later we're at very different places.

Jim: I think we've gotten mired in misinformation in all of this. I think there is an opportunity for HBIs to market themselves in a much more inclusive way. I don't think the effort has been as strong. It cannot be subtle. They could say, "We want to have a diverse student body in our institution with a glorious history of educating minority people when they had no other option."

Chris: What would you want leaders at HBIs to do to make that happen?

Jim: Being out and about, not just in predominantly black high schools. More than anything else, remind people why this institution is an historically black institution. And say we want you to come in and make this institution as diverse as we possibly can. Now we want to be part of the solution. It's about telling the story that you really want to tell.

Elizabeth Brunn: In focusing on suggestions and solutions, higher education has the same problems that businesses have with globalization. A lot of businesses are focusing on smaller units so that there is a greater impact in each unit. Leadership at the top should look at culture and look at how individuals could better be used.

Jim: Give me an example.

Elizabeth: USM comes out with initiatives, e.g., Open Electronic Resources: Collegiate faculty and department chairs were asked to do this, but we had no say in how it would work. We just have to do it. We don't have feedback up to the top.

Jim: That's a campus problem. Regents do not want to micromanage.

Raj: But perhaps there is a way to let upper administrators know that this communication is lacking and that communication would be helpful.

Jim: Is this discussed at the CUSP meetings?

Joann: We discuss this often with the provosts. And I'd like to make this point: We use the attraction model. We make the announcement through campus leadership and ask people to come to us if they want to be involved. At the campus level, you run into this situation in which—we have 14,000 faculty in the system, 14,000 independent contractors. We're working with them as individuals, but also with groups at each institution. What you see is the pushback in the balance we're always trying to achieve. At UB, JC stated that the open dialog in the past 2 to 3 years is starting to make a difference.

Elizabeth: And the leadership is changing the culture. We need to encourage a culture that will permit the presidents to look at this matter from a different perspective.

Jim: One thing I'm tired of hearing is "If we only had more money..." The issue Elizabeth raises has nothing to do with money. It's about communication and dialog. And with regard to independent contractors, in the corporate world as well we have all these individuals, so you have potentially the same issues.

Jo: One of the nuances in higher education is that we're built on the peer review model (not on boss review model). Your model is in the hands of the faculty, not the provost or the president.

Jay: But whenever we have a new provost, the rules shift. And we have to adapt.

Jo: But the faculty are in charge of that.

Nagaraj: We have shared governance that is working, but when we get something sent down to the campuses from the regents, it's "We're hearing this from the regents, what do we do now?"

Elizabeth: At UB, the way they're approaching things is better because they're addressing the culture. People are getting together and they're having dialog, not just a meeting.

JC: It's our meeting, but all the deans come, many administrators come, etc.

Robert: We are already past the 1:00 point, and Chairman Brady wanted to get the last word in.

Jim: I respect what you all do, and to hear your opinions is very helpful to me. As I was listening to this, I was reminded of "Cool Hand Luke." The warden looked at Luke and said, "Son, what we have here is a failure to communicate." I would leave you with the idea to think about the role that you all could play in developing a new message for people about what higher education is. And it's not with having students as customers. They are not customers. They are students who are being prepared for, hopefully, a long and prosperous life. Let's get this message out. Let's be on the offensive, and not the defensive. We need to make that point constantly. This message is lost right now and it's up to us to make the case. I would encourage you to be very aggressive in pushing that forward. Thank you very much for having me.

Jo: If you have follow-up questions, send them to Jim through me.

1:14 Annapolis Day

Chris: It is our lobbying day for USM and our respective constituencies--faculty, staff, and student--go and represent. Our mantra is to support the governor's budget as well as other issues.

Jo: In these conversations, you need to make the case for the value proposition of higher education. Remind folks of what our goal, vision, and mission are. We are educating the future workforce and citizens of Maryland and in doing so we are elevating the workforce of the state.

Chris: This year, we will go out to visit legislators in teams along with staff and with students. Also, if there is a legislator that you know, please let me know if you would like for us to reach out to your legislator. We have meetings set with some legislators. In addition, we host a luncheon at which we will have tables for each university, so that local legislators can visit with the institutions in their legislative areas.

Jo: We have received more than 40 "yes" RSVPs of legislators coming to the luncheon. Give them a story or talking point that they can't forget.

Chris: In the afternoon, we'll try to finish off the visits we couldn't complete in the morning.

Robert: I sent an RSVP to CUSF. And we will need a couple people to arrive early to bring people in as they arrive.

Albert: It's important to do some advance preparation about the people you're going to be meeting.

Ethan: Question for Jo: On our campus, there is an overemphasis on economic workforce development and sports. I'm worried about the shift in emphasis, relative to the prior administration, toward workforce development and sports and away from academics.

Jo: Is this the audience that should hear this message? The legislators can't do anything about this. So these are issues that may better be brought to the BOR.

1:25 SLACK

Robert: We're looking at SLACK, which is a social media platform that will allow us to communicate between meetings. We are a diverse system. It would be good to communicate shared practices at different institutions. By doing so, we could help leverage our institutions and the people in our institutions. Raj has offered to educate us about SLACK.

Raj: This is a social network, but it is really a professional communication network.

Here is how you enter:

Go to [slack.com](https://slack.com)

Give the name of the team.

Sign in.

The administrator will need the email of each prospective member. He/she could email you and ask you to join. You will choose a password.

There are two default channels--#general and #random. In addition to default channels, we can start a channel even for just a few members. We can keep this "public," meaning all members. Or we can make it private and choose members to permit to enter. Let's make a new channel for "legislative affairs," and we'll make it private, so just committee members will be "invited." The advantage over email is that entire discussion is kept in one place. It's like a chat room.

There is a "slackbot" who will answer any questions for you. And there is a help center that provides the basics of how to use slack.

You may also use direct messages to talk to just one person.

The immediacy of it is also very compelling.

Ethan: We use SLACK in Senate. It allows us to flesh things out before a meeting. It's very useful. And you can opt to be very involved or less involved.

Robert: Thank you, Raj, for your good work. The executive committee suggested that we all jump in and get started. Raj has graciously volunteered to be the administrator. Maybe we could do shared practices with the senate chairs and then work into more from there.

??WHO??: We may need a handbook of how to use this, and our goals, etc. And explain there that this is for communication only, and not voting. And that it does not negate need for email.

??WHO??: When you're no longer a member of CUSF, are you removed? Then you no longer have access to the discussion information.

Nagaraj: Slack would be for current CUSF members as well as Senate chairs.

Raj: This is free. And it's very easy to use.

Robert: If it's okay, we can wade into the waters and hopefully not drown.

1:45 Action and Information Items:

Robert: If you have ideas or suggestions for the spring newsletter, please forward them to Beth. Also, look at page 23, which lays out a plan for the rest of the spring semester. We will hold nominations of Executive Committee members in April, and elections in May. And in April and May, we will identify action items we're interested in doing next year. Then we will hit the ground running in fall.

1:48 New business:

Elizabeth Brunn—I would like to suggest that we reserve the 1:00 spot in the March meeting for an open forum in which we can bring ideas for discussion. Our job is to advise and to make recommendations. We need some time to digest ideas together as a group.

Jay: What topics?

Elizabeth: We need to go back and talk to our faculty senates and then come back here and choose some core ideas that we'd like to pursue.

Albert: Elizabeth is reminding us of our mission to advise the BOR. Also, we should move to a consent agenda and work on committee work between meetings so that we may have more productive meetings of discussions.

Robert: In my commentary for next time, I'll lay out some ideas.

Nagaraj: We have faculty senate chairs' meeting twice a year. These meetings improve communication and lead to a report to the Chancellor about shared governance on our campuses. We also send representation to the USM workgroups and receive communications back from the representatives.

Elizabeth: The vast majority of people here are not involved in those workgroups. I want to increase the discussion among us to generate ideas that we might be able to move forward on plagiarism, critical thinking, etc. We have the opportunity to put our positions as faculty members forward.

Nagaraj: It sounds like a very good idea. If we agree to do brainstorming, we should agree to have no motions that day. We should make decisions only after a cooling off period and some further discussion time.

Jay: If you're talking about brainstorming without focus, we'll just drift off somewhere. Why don't we try something where people maybe use Slack and give ideas ahead of time so that we'll have a list as a starting point?

Elizabeth: I would be happy to do that.

Robert: I was thinking this would be a good starting point for the action items for next year.

Jay: The next meeting is at UMUC on a Wednesday and I cannot attend, so if we could work ahead of time as well, then I could provide input as well.

Beth: I think it would be helpful, at the first meeting of the year, to provide orientation to new members about CUSF, committees, Joann and Zakiya, etc.

Jay: We could make a brochure for the webpage that provides an introduction to people coming into CUSF for the first time.

Nagaraj: No motions during that hour.

Robert: We have a motion. Approved.

2:09 Adjournment

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