**UFS Agenda**draft 1/23/18 **Meeting: 7 February 2018
Bogomolny Room – Student Center
Lunch served at 11:30**

**Meeting at 12:00-2:00**

Attending: Mike Kiel (Libraries), Tara Richards (CPA), Jessica Sowa (CPA), Rajesh Mirani (MSB), Greg Walsh (CAS), Julie Simon (CUSF/CAS), Ben Wright (CPA), Jeffrey Ian Ross (CPA), Irv Brown, (Adjunct Advisory), JC Weiss (MSB), David Lingelbach (MSB), Lore Naylor (CPA), Kathryn Summers (CAS), Stephanie Gibson (CAS), Darlene Smith (Provost), Kurt Schmoke (Preseident)

Guests: Victoria Reid (EMM), Monique Clark (Libraries), Barbara Aughebaugh (A&F), Marybeth Woak (A&F), Seyed Mohammedi (A&F), Chris Spencer (CAS), Laura Wilson-Gentry (CPA), Mary Maher (HR), Zach Luhman (CSI), Candace Caracao (Provost), Fiona Glade (Provost), Sally Farley (Honors), Natalie Herring (Admissions), Paul Moniodis (IR), Bill Boyd (A&F), Mark Jacque (EMM), Bill Schnirel (Student Affairs), Neb Sertsu (FMCP), Terese Tonus (CAS), Lucy Holman (Libraries), Aaron Wachhaus (CPA), Sharon Glazer (CAS), Haitham Alkhateeb (CAS)

1. **Logistical items**
	1. Approval of minutes from January 2017. [Sakai] – Approved unanimously
	2. Approval of February 7, 2018 agenda [Sakai] – Approved unanimously
2. **President and Provost** **reports**
	1. Town Hall reflections and next steps

The President thanked the community for a productive Townhall. He has already had some follow up meetings with CAS faculty. Next he will be meeting with the staff senate and others meeting will follow. Moving forward leadership will attempt to examine program offerings separately from budget issues. The Townhall made clear that conflating these gave an impression that budget drives all decisions which shouldn’t be the case. Comments at the Townhall show clearly that everyone recognizes the status quo is unacceptable, and now we must collectively decide on how to move forward. There will be another Townhall in March.

Discussion: Many faculty felt that the Townhall was a good first step but would like more detailed information about the data informing decisions. When will that be forthcoming?

The Provost recognized the need to develop improved dialogue and communication moving forward and noted that more information on the analysis of Shady Grove and FSP programs would be provided later in the agenda. It is hard to give a specific timeline as it will take some time to present information with appropriate context. Faculty should communicate specific requests in the feedback form for the Townhall and the administration will be responsive moving forward. More information will be provided to inform discussion at the Townhall in March.

Specific items noted **during** the meeting that faculty would like information on included the status of counseling services and the centralization of financial services. Faculty also felt that increased transparency around budgeting and financial matters is a potential avenue to improve the morale of the community.

* 1. Coalition update – No updates at this time
	2. UB presentations at USM BOR meeting (2/8-9)
	The President indicated that during the upcoming meeting of the regents he will discuss how the system can be of help with some concerns identified during the recent Townhall. A video from the College of Public Affairs that will be screened for the regents was shown.
	3. General Assembly update – The Governor’s budget proposes a 2% tuition increase, but otherwise there no major legislative developments. A 2% COLA to begin in January 2019 is currently in the budget, but merit increases are not.
	4. CELTT and Online faculty advisory committees
	The online advisory board will report to the reconfigured Academic Support Committee. Catherine Anderson and Natalie Malm will shortly be convening the group after the gathering of online learning plans from the Deans is complete.

	Additional discussion clarified that recommendations to strengthen online offerings coming from the strategic program analysis presented at the January meeting is not a call to replace face to face instruction. Instead it is a recommendation to reexamine and enhance online course offerings or hybrid programs.
	5. MSB-BS in Accounting
	A proposal was discussed to create a new BS in accounting. Currently this is MSB’s largest specialization, but it is at a disadvantage with similar programs in part because of how it is identified in search engine optimization as students explore choices. The proposal moves it from a specialization to a degree, adding one course as a requirement. There has thus far been no feedback from other system schools with accounting programs, UMUC recently created a similar program.

	The MOTION was Approved unanimously
1. **Marketing and enrollment** – updates
New scholarship strategy – Discussion of a new scholarship strategy was deferred till March but current enrollment was discussed.

At the time of the meeting the drop period had not concluded and the census was therefore pending. The University seems to have exceeded the “most likely” projections with an enrollment of 5179 compared to a projection of 5116. Particularly notable is the enrollment of new students which greatly exceeded the projection with 638 compared to 540. This is particularly encouraging as it has carry on effects in the fall as students are retained. Work continues to prepare for the brand launch, which will occur in March. More information should be forthcoming later this week identifying a date for this launch.

1. **UFS President’s report** **& discussion**
	1. SPBC – reconfigure committee
	The faculty senate leadership are encouraged to hear the President’s comment about meeting with CAS and the splitting of academic planning and budgeting. This is the same approach the SPBC would like to have, and faculty are reminded to submit their names if they would like to serve.
	2. Faculty Appeals committee update – The appeal that the committee has been working on is resolved. The Provost and UFS President thanked the committee for their service and noted that the report was a comprehensive and insightful document demonstrating real commitment to governance.
	3. MHEC 5 year review –
	Every 5 years MHEC develops a new plan which serves as the impetus for a review of the mission statements of each University. The goal of this review is to ensure that there is alignment, and the current timeline would mandate submitting information over the summer. The Board of Regents reviews mission statements, but often this is not a problem. In the last cycle only one school was asked for revisions.

	Discussion: How does the system take the role of universities into account when developing their plans?
	When the plan is developed it should take into account the landscape of the state. Anyone can submit feedback on the plan in theory, not just those directly involved in higher education. The goals of the plan are often broadly similar: building economy, helping individuals schools, etc.
	4. Elections for UFS – Each year new officers are elected at the May senate meeting, and they must be members for the **coming** academic year. Therefore if individual senates need to hold elections these must be completed in April. These elections should also include representatives on any committees to ensure they can convene promptly in the fall.
	5. Policies – University polices on institutional surveys and websites are open for comment till the end of this month. Senators are asked to share them with other faculty. Copies are also in Sakai.
2. **Committee** **reports/actions**
	1. Ad hoc bylaws committee
	This committee has been populated as follows and will be convened shortly by the senate President.
		1. Dave Matchen (LIB)
		2. Betsy Nix (CAS)
		3. Stephanie Gibson (CAS)
		4. Michael Hayes (Law)
		5. Steve Isberg (MSB)
		6. Ben Wright (CPA)
		7. JC Weiss (MSB)
	2. Academic support committee – charge edit and work plan
	Following a recent meeting of the committee a modified charge was presented which focuses on helping CELTT and the libraries. They committee has also developed a workplan in anticipation of approval. In response to a question about the potentially confusing name of the committee it was agreed that this should be reexamined in the future.
	VOTED and Approved

	Discussion: Because the work of the committees can impact each other it was suggested that there be a meeting of all the chairs once a semester so they can have a conversation about their work plans. It was noted that this might be a good bylaw.
	3. APC – No updates this month
	4. Graduate council update - No updates this month
3. **A&F** **update** –Both analyses discussed are available in Sakai
**Shady Grove Analysis**
A multiyear analysis was presented from 2009-17. Tuition revenue is derived from credit hours multiplied by tuition rate. Expenses are part fees paid to the system, but there are also expenses for using rooms etc. Some grant funding is being used, shown as offsets to expenses. This money is intended to seed programs. USM money of this kind typically lasts 2 years, but is sometimes negotiated for a third.

Discussion: As they are profitable, do we anticipate the other schools developing Shady Grove programs?
A certification offered by MSB is in development, Law is not considering programs at this time, in part because of rules and regulations from the ABA. There may potentially be some non JD offerings in the future. Shady Grove is currently constructing a new STEM, to the extent possible we’d like to focus in that direction to benefit from seed money.

Discussion – Are we obligated to have programs at Shady Grove? And do we pay the same fee regardless?
UB is not obligated to have programs, but strongly encouraged. There is currently some ongoing dialogue about the Shady Grove business model as well as discussions about a new regional center in Southern Maryland.

**Lower Division Analysis**
In response to a request in November by the President to examine the costs, A&F looked at FY17 data. The initial analysis determined there was a profit of ~ 5 million. A difficult piece of the analysis was deciding how many faculty lines to include in the costs of the freshman and sophomore program. As an example, library faculty were not included as their costs to the university would remain even if the program were eliminated. Some faculty expressed concerns about some of the assumptions in the analysis or the methodology but were appreciative of the analysis.
4. **Items for CUSF** **/ CUSF update**
	1. Academic integrity – The CUSF educational policy committee was charged with examining academic dishonesty among students. Among their findings: dishonesty now starts in elementary school, apps and AI are enhancing existing problems this worse as are online test repositories. Academic dishonesty has been an increasing problem in online coursework and while technological solutions such as IP tracing have been helpful, they are not without problems.

	The committee proposes several solutions:
		1. That the state and system need an updated understanding and articulation of academic integrity.
		2. Laws prohibiting paper mills and fraud
		3. Enhanced technological solutions.

The regents are currently giving feedback to the CUSF committee, and the same committee is working with the Kirwan center to develop an action plan. A Powerpoint summarizing the findings is available in Sakai

The Provost noted that this is a topic of interest to the regents and that higher education has had a reactive approach, rather than a proactive one. A different approach might mean developing a University learning outcome, with repeated teaching and assessment. There was some agreement with this idea, but also faculty noted that we must take into account the social and technological environment.

1. **College/School** updates
The updates were skipped for time

**Important upcoming dates**

* Spring Commencement: May 23, 2018
* UFS 2017-18 meeting dates:
	+ 3/7/18
	+ 4/4/18
	+ 5/2/18