**UFS Minutes**

**January 13, 2021**

Attendance: Mike Kiel, Tina Di Franco, Kristen Eyssell, Stef Shaffer, Jeff Ian Ross,

Dave Bobart, Chris Spencer, Connie Harris, Barbara Augenbaugh, Beth Amyot, Kathea Smith, Carol Molinari, Irv Brown, JC Weiss, Frank Vliet, Catherine Andersen, Mark Jacque, Ser James, Sally Farley, Dave P., Alan Weisman, Kurt Schmoke, Phil Korb, Julie Simon, Lore Naylor, Murray Dalziel, Aaron Wachhaus, Candace Caraco, Mike Frederick, Greg Walsh, Sarah Gilchrest, Michael Hayes, David Lingelbach, Terese Thonus, Marilyn Oblak, Syed M., Laura Wilson-Gentry, Elias Nader, Mary Beth Waak, Antieris, Nicole Marano, Roger Hartley, Margaret Gillingham, Paul Moniodus, Sally Reed, Sharon Glazer, Sascha Sheehan, Sean Hogan, Magui Cardona, Michael Schocket, Allison Jennings-Roche, Deb Stanley, Alicia Campbell, Dan Gerlowski, Heather Pfeifer, Neb Sertsu, Cindy McGowan, Vineda Myers, Wabei Chitambala, Amir Pezeshkan, John Chapin, Karen Karmiol, Kyle Breneman, Suzanne Tabor, Ron Castanzo, Mortimer Sellers, Another John, 1.24E+10 (?), Bill. (69 in attendance)

**Meeting called to order – 12:01 p.m. Consent Agenda**

*Logistical Items*

* Agenda – M/S approved
* Minutes from December meeting - M/S approved

*Information Items*

* Internal Faculty Survey Results – Shout out to Law School for recent webinar.
* Syllabus Template Update – addresses the recording statement

There was concern regarding student cameras being off during Zoom sessions and not actively participating in class. Issues arose with confirming attendance. Attendance has financial aid implications so it is important to be able to determine attendance and participation by students. The recording statement that was initially was developed was done so under guidance from Kirwin Center. However, in consultation with the A/G office, the recording statement was revised over break. We must be understanding of, and flexible with, students as they may be facing challenges. Nevertheless, we have legal reasons for requiring cameras – to document attendance.

* BoR Taskforce Implementation Reports - we will not be receiving reports from all committees, but will rotate in subsequent meetings.

**Action items**

* **Workload Committee Charge**

Draft charge for consideration. M/S to approve as written.

Discussion:

Charge was drafted by Mike Kiel, Stephanie Gibson, and Candace Caraco

It was expressed that it may be difficult at this juncture to address workload policy because everyone is volunteering on multiple other committees. Nevertheless, we see the need for this policy rewrite.

If you require additional information/data – reach out to Candace Caraco.

Motion passed Resolutions (carrying over from last meeting)

* + **SGA Automatic doors Resolution** – (carry over from last meeting)

Resolution applies to automatic door access to disability services, veterans center and admissions. Potentially expand to other areas.

M/S as written

Discussion: Cost of install was a concern, as well as the reasonableness of the timeline for initial installation.

Motion passed

* + **SGA Single use plastic** - (carry over from last meeting)

M/S to table the Resolution

Discussion:

Baltimore City recently passed a law regarding containers and also one addressing plastic bags.

This Resolution should be tabled because we don’t know what the implication will be on single use plastics. Of course, we will comply with Baltimore City Law. The language of the Resolution is not consistent with the Title.

Motion to table – passed.

* + **Diversity training**

M/S - Passed

**Deviation from Agenda** – Mike Kiel suggests charging Academic policy committee to address grading policy

Charge: ACP investigate options for a limited number of credits in undergraduate degrees (Mike will send to me and Kris) to be taken on a pass/fail basis with timeline for report by end of spring 2021 semester.

M/S

Discussion:

This may be helpful to students who are taking a course not in their major and is a conversation that is taking place across campus and in Colleges.

There is a potential for ACP to review policy and perhaps issue a temporary policy so we are prepared.

Motion passed with friendly amendment regarding timeframe.

**Strategic discussion Items**

* Pandemic Related Information for the Spring and Fall

President Schmoke – Happy new year to everyone. We are navigating turbulent times. Thank you for hard work during the fall semester, compliments from students far outweighed any complaints. Ask us to focus on what happened in Georgia, which spoke to the best of our country.

We will get through this together.

1. Pandemic Issue – drafted proposed plan on reopening based on 2 assumptions

 A. improvement in public health situation

 B. testing policy by USM

Infection rate remains high in Baltimore City (Level 1) in addition to variation in Covid strain

USM has mandated that all campuses test everyone at least twice per week for those regularly on campus and once a week for casual attendees.

If you are on campus 2 days per week you are considered “regularly” on campus. No students meet this on our campus. However, 78 people do meet the definition of regularly attending – housekeeping, library, police, mail. If we open access to more people, then the 78 regularly attending number goes up. Currently, those present on campus 1 day per week = 50. In regard to testing, USM has provided 1100 “test kits.” That is only enough test kits to get through 6 weeks at UB. UB must then order test kits beyond what USM has given for free. The cost of each test is approx. $5.00. We are currently exploring the cost of acquiring test kits.

Also, being considered: how many can be in library at one time, opening pantry – how many people at once, how many allowed in outdoor spaces.

UB is seeking guidance from 2 sources UMMS give updates and consultation with Baltimore City Health Commissioner. Sally Reed and Neb get briefings from their counterparts.

Question: With regard to testing: Are you considering whether it make sense to hire someone on contractual basis – MD, Nurse?

President Schmoke – yes because of reactions to vaccine. We have run into problems ordering antigen tests because we don’t have a provider – Sally and Neb working with UM on this. We are also considering partnering with UM Midtown or Coppin Health facility.

Question: Has the system addressed with fall semester – whether vaccine will be required?

President Schmoke – I’m planning on reopening in fall 2021. Governor has moved educators up in priority for vaccination. USM is working to get Higher Ed educators moved up in priority as well. But I’m planning for robust opening in fall 2021 semester.

Question: If you can’t achieve anything else – let us give our exams in person. Very difficult to administer online and monitor.

President Schmoke – we are focused on that.

The Board of Regent’s Taskforce Implementation Teams

President Schmoke – I understand that there is substantial overlap in recommendations and conversation is being encouraged among and between committees. I am looking for teams to send me recommendations on implementing and I will make decisions regarding priorities. The process is teams making recommendations that are sent to President for decision-making then President will report to USM. The team recommendations should address policy and the financial implications of the recommendations. Ultimately, I am held accountable.

* + Group 4: Academic Portfolio

Catherine Andersen– Everyone is doing much service, but we must focus on immediate needs. At the BoR meeting yesterday, they were interested in the definition of a low enrolled program. What do you do with them and what is the timeline. Of critical importance is retention – we are careful to look at graduating students and retention. Shout out to everyone for returning students we are about 2% behind last semester.

Murray Dalziel 3 parts to Recommendation 4

1. Strategic plan – Roger Hartley leading. What has been done so far.

2. Development of scorecard

Murray Dalziel: We are expecting to present basic scorecard soon. We need to look at a manageable number of programs to review. Between Jan 1 and today we are still cleaning data so it is presentable and useable. Once completed will go back to the Colleges. I am just the agenda director, faculty that should be taking lead in this.

3. Review of current programs. –

Murray Dalziel: this is academic portfolio for the university.

Discussion on Group 4 –

There is a concern that the scorecard is an internal scorecard and does not speak, except at the margins, as to how our graduates are doing in the professional world.

Murray Dalziel – We did create an impact factor – schools will have to provide measures. In Merrick – for example, we had someone go in and track how much our graduates are making. Need to go beyond that. However, the timeline to do this work is too tight, therefore, we had to come up with measures that we could get data for.

Catherine Andersen: agree it is on the margins, but there was not a consistent measure we could apply to all programs.

Comment: Data concerning our graduates has been asked for over many years. Also, this scorecard is not about student success.

Murray Dalziel – it does have reporting measures for student success. My suggestion is to come back to this issue in the future. We are expected to update the scorecard every year.

Murray Dalziel– Overall there is agreement as a committee on short process, it covers the range of measures that we look at. There is some contention – but it can be ironed out by looking at data, FRM data by major and FRM by course view. Programs are required to be reviewed not courses.

None of schools are doing things perfectly – all colleges review differently. We are trying to take a holistic approach.

Catherine Andersen – this is an effective group and share their concerns. We will make recommendations to Kurt,

We have all participated in numerous exercises on this campus. Are there industry wide measures that we can consult. What are the industry wide measures we could use?

Murray Dalziel– Will circulate additional information.

Mike K. – suggested discussion in faculty senates and refer questions to me.

Question: Is there any change – are we expected to come up with ways to address the 10-million-dollar deficit. See report of Group 7

* + Group 7: Financial Responsibility

Beth Amyot: Submitted our report on Dec. 14, 2020. The work we are focused on relates directly to financial health of the university. The team has 14 members. Our report will show a large number of recommendations. Team decided to break into smaller groups. Small groups meet regularly, then all of Team 7 comes together to discuss small group work.

Keep in mind that work for Team 7 has 2 components:

1. Right-sizing and aligning UB

2. Balancing the budget to position UB to thrive. Difficult, but vital.

Focus is on financial decisions that are intended to support the mission and priority purpose of the university. We have to wait for other committee work to be completed because of interdependencies. However, we are proceeding. We have identified connections between Team 7 and other teams. We have spoken with Enrollment team regarding enrollment projections and have created a new method by which regular updates from each implementation team to quantify the favorable and unfavorable impact on spending and convert that information to financial terms.

Our team is moving forward with work we can do without input from other committees.

We are using multiple revenue scenarios re: enrollments – so we are moving forward.

As months progress the content of Team 7 reports will become more detailed and actionable. It is acknowledged that Team 7 will likely bring the darkest news to the UB community.

Question: The university was put on the spot with deadlines. Given Team 7 is where the pain and suffering will come from in terms of reductions, what will timeline be – don’t want to wake up on March 15 and find that jobs have been eliminated. When will we start to see this information?

Beth Amyot– in this case we are thinking alike about the timeline. That, in part, is what prompted the financial impact reports from committees. However, we want to provide the time for the teams to provide the financial impact. I’m not sure we can have total visibility to hit March 15 date. I am waiting to see other reports before looking at closing the gap. In summary: look out for recommendations after Feb. 1 because that will help us see what might unfold. Thurs 1/21 is another opportunity to learn more about the financial matters.

Question addressed to Kurt Schmoke –Is there flexibility around timelines?

Kurt Schmoke: Deadlines are serious. If we show them a realistic plan on how we are getting into balance. By March 15 I have to show them something very specific. If requires reduction in force – that can’t happen before July 1. For example, we informed them of a student/faculty ratio of 15:1, however, we didn’t give them specific information. By the deadlines, we must be specific.

Beth Amyot: One of the 12 work groups is doing scenario planning that will create a framework for discussion. For example – we can make assumptions that enrollment is flat, we can make revenue assumptions and plan for the scenarios. At a contextual level – primary spending is in a couple of areas. If it does require reductions, the individual units will address.

Catherine Andersen– In terms of cuts, the most our team could do was list retirements. Savings for teach-out will not be realized for some time. Moving programs online – might be saving some physical space. However, there are MHEC implications for moving a face to face program to online.

Beth Amyot: offering informational sessions devoted to financial matters. The first timeslot is January 21 at 1:00 pm.

* + Group 8: Physical Campus

Mike Kiel – focus on 8.1

Neb Sertsu– Course delivery formats have been submitted, evaluations related to functions is continuing remotely – there should be a report by end of month (January)

8.3 recommendations and beyond are due in April and May, 2021.

At this point the completed report recommends maintaining the current footprint. Current = 800,000 square feet. Mt. Royal is 17, 000 square feet. If BoR was looking to reduce footprint significantly then we are not moving in the right direction.

If we are not clear soon what buildings will be reopening in fall – it will be difficult for us to know what to get ready.

Issue: From what the regents see when they look at our master plan is that in every one of the buildings we have surplus in classrooms and office space. (Last masterplan is from 2015).

We are using more space than our population. This can be addressed but it will not be simple.

Question: Did you look at possibility of mothballing the buildings?

Neb Sertsu: it would reduce operating costs (Schafer Center). Ability to do that is arriving at an agreement across the institution as to what buildings will be open. If we are talking about a meaningful change on how we use our campus.

Candace Caraco – in reducing footprint, we also need to be aware of public perception. Moreover, the Regents look at daytime usage.

Neb –The earlier we are clear on what the choices are, the more prepared we will be. Selling buildings will not benefit University.

Meeting Adjourned.

Upcoming Meetings:

* + Feb 3
		- Code of Conduct and Other Policies
		- Enrollment Taskforce Group
	+ March 3
	+ April 7
	+ May 5