**University of Baltimore University Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

**September 6th, 2017 – 12:00-2:00 pm**

 **(DRAFT)**

**Attendees:** J.C. Weiss (MSB and President), Stephanie Gibson (CAS and Vice-President), Darlene Smith (Provost) Kurt Schmoke, David Lingelbach (MSB), Greg Walsh (CAS), Kathryn Summers (CAS), Michael Hayes (Law), Lorenda Naylor (CPA, for Ben Wright), Jessica Sowa (CPA), Maggie Dull (Langsdale), Rajesh Mirani (MSB), Julie Simon (CAS/CUSF), M.N. Sellers (Law), Cassandra Jones Havard (Law), Jeffrey Ian Ross (CPA).

**Guests:** Aaron Wachhaus (CPA), Haitham Alkhateeb (CAS), Catherine Andersen (Provost) Victoria Reid (EMM), Neb Sertsu (VP FM and CP), Ronald Weich (Law/Dean), Alicia Campbell (Provost), Fiona Glade (Provost), Karen Karmiol (Provost), Candace Caraco (Provost), Irvin Brown (CPA), Laura Wilson-Gentry (CPA), Mark Jacque (EMM), Antoinette Joseph (A&F), Shana Bynon (A&F), Stephen Shirley (CPA), Megan Marley (CPA), Sally Reed (HR), Mary Maher (HR), Jeffrey Sawyer (CAS), Danielle Giles (MSB), Catherine Leidemer (Marketing), Barbara Aughenbaugh (A&F), Keiver Jordan (A&F), John Chapin (ALC/Langsdale), Ann Cotten (CPA/Schaefer Center), Vicki Schultz (Law), Kristin Conlin (CAS/Langsdale), Debbie Kohl (CAS/Dean’s Office), Lucy Holman (Langsdale/Dean), Betsy Nix (CAS/LEHS), Shelia Burkhalter (Student Affairs), Nicole Marano (Provost).

**Absent:** Eric Stull, Ben Wright

**Meeting began at: 12:04 pm**

1. **Logistical items:**
	* Approval of minutes from August 2017: Approved.
	* Approval of September 6, 2017 agenda: Approved.
2. **President’s Report:**
	* Board of Public Works approved continuing on with the Post Office site. This means that UB can accept proposals regarding work on that site without additional state approval. This is a major step forward.
	* **Fall Commencement Speaker:**
		+ In the spirit of civility and increased dialogue and the need for those of us of differing opinions to talk to each other, Kurt Schomke invited Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos to be the Fall 2017 Commencement Speaker. When the invitation was extended, DeVos had not yet laid out her agenda on higher education and the hope is that she will use this platform to do so. As with Janet Yellen, Chair of the Federal Reserve, spoke at the Fall 2016 Commencement there will be a lunch beforehand. He sees this as an opportunity for debate and discussion within the UB community.
		+ Stephanie Gibson expressed that commencement is not exactly an opportunity for debate and discussion. How does this help the University of Baltimore?
		+ Kurt Schmoke expressed he felt that it is important to have the Secretary of Education come to talk to our graduates. While we won’t always agree with whoever serves in that role, this will show UB as a place that is open for differing views and it will be a benefit to us.
		+ Kathryn Summers expressed concerns that graduation is a celebratory experience and normally the speaker is someone to be admired and serve as a role model for graduates. She believes we are sending the wrong message to our graduates if we invite DeVos to serve as this kind of a role model. Summers agrees that it would be good to have her as a speaker at UB, but in another context.
		+ Jessica Sowa asked if the administration considered the possibility of people coming to protest.
		+ Kurt Schmoke: Of course. If people do come to protest, we hope it’s in a civil manner. DeVos’s office took a look at the profile of our Fall graduates – typically older students more focused on education as a career benefit and that we were recently ranked as an institution that does well at promoting the social mobility of our graduates and the preponderance of adult learners. Schmoke understands that this choice of speaker is not something that will be applauded by all at the University and he takes full responsibility for the invitation. But he thinks that in the long run the University will benefit in the public arena for having her here and allowing her to address our graduates. He reiterated that this is entirely his idea, stemming from when DeVos was appointed and his wanting to know what she would say about higher education and when. Schmoke did speak to the Chancellor of the USM, but has not reached out to anyone at Bethune-Cookman University (where DeVos spoke in Februrary). He doesn’t believe protests like those at Bethune-Cookman will happen here.
		+ Kathryn Summers asked for clarification on the process for selecting a commencement speaker – is there a committee, are students or student government involved at all, etc.
		+ Kurt Schmoke related that in the future he will create a body that helps to select the speaker, but we do not have one yet. He also clarified that DeVos will not receive an honorary doctorate.
	* **State / USM / UB budget planning:**
		+ Kurt Schmoke addressed short term and long term issues relating to the financial stability of the University. The enrollment of UB is about the same size that it was in 2007-2008. However, ten years ago we had more students in the Law school and did not have the administrative structure/costs we have now. We’ve seen growth in CPA, CAS, and an uptick now in MSB, but we are still feeling the financial impact of being overly reliant on the Law school for the financial stability of the University. While Law can grow, it will never get back to a height of 1100 students (compared to 700 today). Thus we have to deal with structural issues. UB is looking at program prioritization – essentially identifying programs that are consistently enrolled, those that are woefully under-enrolled, as well as teaching loads, number of administrators, and overall program spending. The goal is to bring the University financial situation into balance this year, as well as going forward. UB is an enrollment dependent university. Today’s enrollment numbers are 5555, which is better than the last report but still below the goal of 6100. A hiring and traveling freeze is in effect. We can anticipate a mid-year spending cut by the Governor, who cut USM funding by $8 million. Kurt will convene another meeting today regarding the budget with the goal of having some sort of decision by October 1. Bottom line – the belt-tightening will have to continue with the goal of being more stable next year and the year after.
		+ Stephanie Gibson asked why October 1 for the deadline on the budget?
		+ Kurt indicated that if we can’t figure out how to solve the problem by other means, by that date he’ll have to look at layoffs/furloughs. He also noted that the Executive Team has agreed to take a 10% salary cut for this year.
3. **UFS President’s Report :**
	* **UFS Committee charges – edit, revisions, AY18 workplan:**

Stephanie Gibsson: She will send out to all committee chairs their current charges (which are also on the UFS website). Chairs are asked to look at their charges and and do three things.

* + 1. Edit the charge – they’re poorly written and have typos etc.
		2. Look at the charges and see if they need to be revised in anyway so that it will make clearer what the purview of your committee is. Right now a number of the charges are somewhat vague. Make it clear what your committee does.
		3. What is your workplan for this year – on top of what the UFS might assign, what would you like to work on this year? Have them done in three weeks – by the 27th September. Then the Executive Committee will take a look, comment etc.
	+ **Policy items for APC**

The APC is very hard at work. There are several things that they’re working on. The full list was circulated to the UFS Executive Committee and is available on Sakai.

1. **Provost’s Report**
	* **Dissemination of Middle States letter**

We were successfully reaffirmed with no issues. The official letter from Middle States, and the report, was circulated to the UFS Executive Board and will be up on the Middle States web site soon. We are now on an 8 year cycle, so will do a mid-term report in four years.

* + **University Committee Staffing**

The Provost’s Office is trying to get resolution between Faculty and Staff Senates regarding the staffing of the University committees. The goal is to improve that process as well as better aligning the committees with UB’s strategic priorities.

* + **University Diversity and Culture committee**

The University does not currently have a formal diversity plan. Conversations in the Faculty and Student Senate indicate a need a recruitment and retention plan for a diverse faculty. The Provost’s Office is hosting a one day retreat or workshop regarding diverse faculty within USM. Best practices within the System. It’s a common goal within the System. The meeeting will occur this fall and will support our efforts to move our own plans forward.

* + **Other business**

The process of preparing for Middle States indicated that the University needs to embrace evidence-based decision making, combining it with intuition. This lead to the creation of the three Task Forces discussed in the previous UFS Meeting. Their work -- especially that of the Strategic Planning and Budgeting Task Force -- is particularly important in this current environment. Program Prioritization is another key step. Since 2007 we’ve seen a 2% increase in headcount, 4% increase in student credit hour production, and a 30% increase in new programs. We need to look at where we can invest to best achieve UB’s goals. This means cost-cutting, re-alignment, and possibly cutting programs. This will first require a comprehensive analysis of the full portfolio of our academic offerings. In the coming weeks, the data from the Program Prioritization project will be shared to units for discussion. We need to do a much better job at retaining our existing students, moving them to graduation faster and better, and ensuring we have the pathways and best practices to guide them. We have to increase retention to be successful. Marketing and Branding are also key. We are operating in a hypercompetitive, noisy marketplace. We need to break through the clutter with brand recognition that, with our programs, will increase enrollment etc. Some are short term/immediate, and some are long term. Investing in a brand has significant long-term implications. It all starts with the sales funnel – which starts with a strong brand. These investments are absolutely essential. Provost Smith thanked to all who participated on the Task Forces and the significant effort/work that people put in on top of their jobs.

1. **Marketing and Branding – what are the urgent steps being taken?**
	* Victoria Reid led the conversation. Our enrollment is at 5555, which is several hundred students below our goal. We wanted a modest 2% growth, but this still meant that we needed to do better overall. There are shortfalls on new students in undergrad and with transfers. We’ll be flat on graduate students, though we expected to see some growth. The numbers for undergrad speaks to the work we need to do around the Freshmen and Sophomore experience. As for transfers, we saw good application momentum in the spring that fell off and which also coincided with a strong campaign by UMUC for students to complete their degrees for $12K. UB is looking to our partners at the community colleges and looking to see what the trends are telling us about the transfer environment and the programs that we offer. UB is aggressively doing a couple of things. There is a strong recruitment and CRM (customer relation management) push. Natalie Dabrowski is working hard with admissions team to pilot several different things – for example, holding a Sunday session since we don’t get a particular audience on Saturday. They are also trying new things regarding recruitment/open houses/information sessions. Victoria shared some of the new recruitment materials. If you want materials so you can go out and talk to the community about our students/alumni etc., talk to her and she’ll be happy to provide you with materials. There is also a push for late enrollees –and there are plans in place to help them even though they’re coming in a little late.
	* Branding Effort with Ologie:

Ologie is a branding firm out of Ohio. They’ve worked with numerous institutions on branding and how to tell their stories in an effective way. For example, they’ve worked with Towson University, Bowie State University, and Gonzaga. They will be here next week to continue to work with us.

* + - Objectives for the branding effort:
			* Understand current perceptions of the university through comprehensive research
			* Evolve the UB brand through positioning and messaging strategy, dynamic creative platform (What does this look like visually?), brand training and deep socialization. How do we share this information/train people about the brand/internalize.
			* Strength UB’s competitive advantage and reputation
			* Activate the evolved brand through strategic marketing and communications.
		- We want a story that feels good to us, true to us, but also resonates with our audience. We want to be able to all talk from the same playbook about what our brand means.
		- Timeline:
			* Survey – closes on September 14th
			* Focus Group Sessions – faculty, students, alumni, stakeholders, and a Core Branding Team – w/o 11th
			* External Stakeholder Survey – will be sent out in October
			* Strategy Development and presentation – November
			* Creative concept development and testing – November/December
			* Creative refinement and brand guidelines development – January
			* Brand Training – February
		- Case study of the University of Buffalo (part of the SUNY system). They face very similar challenges to what we face at our UB. Victoria showed their “Positioning Statement” – a video that shows how they go to “Here is How”, how Buffalo is a place where things happen. [<http://ologie.com/case-study/university-at-buffalo/>]
		- Greg Walsh noted that we don’t really “have” UB anymore since Buffalo is UB. Are we looking at UBalt as a brand?
		- Victoria replied that Ologie can come back and recommend anything based on what they’re gathering. Anything is on the table
		- Kurt Schmoke noted that they are now the University AT Buffalo not Of Buffalo.
1. **Student Success & Retention Plan:**
* Presented by Nicole Marano and Shelia Burkhalter.
* The work of the Task Force is now done and culminated in a 30 page plan. But now the real work begins as we actualize the plan.
* The Task Force undertook a comprehensive review of internal and external best practices, held bi-weekly meetings, and undertook an internal advising audit.
* Overall takeaways – We know that we are doing some really good things here, such as first year learning communities, mandatory advising for certain cohorts of students, Guides to Graduation (but not for all programs), and a large number of mentoring programs across the University. However, UB must institutionalize some of these initiatives in order to more positively impact student success and retention
* Strategies:
	+ 1 – Maximize use of analytics and increase the sharing of data. MSCHE taught us that we have a lot of information here, but not everyone knew about it or how to utilize it. Take this information and make it more available and use it to make decisions.
	+ 2 – Enhance the student’s institutional experience. Task Force members were very student focused/student faced, so brought many of these concerns to the committee. How can we make this easier for our students to navigate? Institutional Communication plan – make sure people are getting the information they need at the time that is useful for them, when they are ready to receive them. Reduce jargon. Gunning Fogg index – need to be a 7 or an 8 but our websites etc. are at a 12.8 or higher.
	+ 3 – Increase UB’s affordability. 75% of UB undergrad students are considered economically disadvantaged. What can we do, how can we innovate for them? For example, how our payment plans and dropping courses work. None of us can do this alone and they’re going to need the help of everyone. Also student employment – students who are employed on campus tend to me more successful.
	+ 4 – Enhance academic advising. We are well on our way to implementing (or have implemented) some of these best practices. Saw some of these strategic in pockets in UB, but not across the board. Adviser-advisee mapping now functional in MyUB. Will do a training with program heads so they understand what the students are seeing. UB Universal Campaigns – 5 total.
	+ 5 – Provide guided pathways to success in order to increase on-time graduation. Clear and direct pathways to degree completing will allow for more timely graduation.
	+ 6 – Expand early alerts. Of all kinds. Expanded this semester to 200 level gen eds. Reach out to students in online courses who are not engaged.
	+ 7 – Identify and remediate administrative policies and process that impeded student success. With the work by Candace and the APC. Student attendance and financial aid – a Federal requirement so we’ll be talking about this a lot this year. Review drop/add deadlines.
	+ 8 – Enhance faculty engagement and promote excellence in teaching and academic support.
	+ 9 – Promote student engagement and collegiate sense of belonging. Increase connections between advising, career placement, and faculty.
* Rajesh Mirani asked about the course redesign.
* Nicole and Shelia indicated that the group looked at courses with high DFW rates. The intent is to revamp courses – undergrad and grad – with a mind towards student success.
* Jessica Sowa asked how do we socialize students to online learning and instructional design?
* The Report calls for more support for faculty teaching online courses as well as for students who are taking the courses.
* Greg Walsh emphasized that this is an issue in online asynchronous courses, not synchronous.
* Jessica Sowa raised a concern that often students don’t come to office hours because they think they’re bothering us. Did that come up at all in the report:
* Shelia indicated that office hours were looked at in the report. There is a concern 50% of our first year students are first generation college students and are perhaps apprehensive of exposing themselves as such or battling with feeling unworthy. This may lead to them becoming more introverted and afraid to ask questions. There is a desire to embark on a comprehensive education program about the attitudes of first-gen students. For example, mandating at least one session of office hours to break down those attitudes or misconceptions and to start to build relationships.
* Slides will be forthcoming, as well as the report
1. **Strategic Program Analysis – data and next steps**
* A sample analysis handout was provided.
* Laura Wilson-Gentry led the discussion, with Darlene Smith helping to facilitate the discussion.
* Context – we’re trying to increase enrollment. 2% enrollment increase, 4% student credit hour increase, but programs are up by 30%. The Task Force wanted to take a look at our portfolio of academic programs to see what is working and what is not working.
* Goals:
	+ To make transparent the relative performance of each program
	+ To identify programs where investment would yield strong University outcomes
	+ To pinpoint programs that need to improve or face a reduction in resources.
* Dickeson Model: Used for an opportunity analysis – which will really come in the next stage.
* Metrics: had to look for data for all programs, comparably collected, and centrally collected.
* Recommended Demand Metrics: Applications, admissions, and enrollments. Also doing an analysis of market share, of all 4 year institutions in the state of Maryland and looking at UB’s share of the market for our programs. Looking also at C=college interdependency – how much do programs rely on another?
* Recommended Quality Metrics: Degrees awarded (also possibly a demand), graduate rate, full-time faculty coverage, and licensure pass rates (which is harder to collect from various databases).
* Financial Metrics: Contribution Margins - net revenue minus costs
* Tuition: Looked at published rates and drilled down to the student level. Then allocated it to the student’s major/program. But then factored in financial aid. State supported financial aid – meaning that it is state money here at the University that could be used elsewhere, compared to Federally supported financial aid which is revenue coming into the university.
* Instructional Costs: Faculty salary plus composite fringe rate.
	+ Rajesh Mirani raised the issue that 100% application of faculty salaries implies that full-time faculty are being compensated solely for their teaching, not their research. In MSB the breakdown is 60%/30%/10% for Teaching/Research/Service. So by allocating 100% to teaching is penalizing programs where faculty are highly qualified as research faculty. This can lead to false results and risk of making certain programs look unprofitable.
	+ Jeffery Ross echoed some of these concerns. Also no program runs solely on instructional efforts alone. Can this model accommodate for that?
	+ Laura replied that this is a first generation model. The Task Force really grappled with how to balance the differential workloads across the campus. The thought was that the 100% of the salary would be a way to equalize that.
* Allocation of Instruction Costs Across Multiple Career Levels: Created a weight system.
	+ Stephanie Gibson indicated that we don’t pay people like this – e.g. more for doctorate.
	+ Darlene Smith replied that it does impact how we recruit. Also tuition is higher at these levels, so by doing this the graduate programs suffer less in the analysis.
* Administrative Costs – Best practice/standard methodology for theses allocations, based on headcount.
	+ Dave Lingelbach commented that accounting colleague says that allocating by headcount isn’t in fact best practices, as stated by the Task Force.
* Next Steps: School and Departmental Review: Will ask schools and departments to do their own review based on the listed metrics.
* Review of example handout, which applies the analysis to three sample programs:
	+ Contribution Margin Report: Trying to assess relative performance. Doesn’t matter if it’s down to the dollar – but relative tuition, relative costs, etc. These are not budget models, but a process and methodology to assess the relative strength of a portfolio.
	+ Contribution Margin does not take into account all of the associate costs. Our current problem is our contribution margin – we don’t have enough left over to pay the bills of the university.
	+ The reverse of the handout same three programs but shows all of the variables (except market share, which they’re still working on).
* Darlene Smith noted that this analysis is just one part of the equation. We do not have the resources to invest in all programs. We need to invest where we know we’ll get the highest possible ROI for the institution.
* Marilyn Oblak noted an issue with the context. We need to remember the fact that we implemented Freshman program at the same time we saw a drop in Law enrollment. We were at 6000 in 1990 as well, and they went through a different cyclical decline (in MSB then).
* Darlene Smith replied that the context is financial stability. For once, at least let’s have the data out there and use it as one of the consideration points. We were asked to be less intuitive and more data driven.
* Stephanie Gibson asked that the data be shared. There are issues with assumptions inherent in the data collection.
* Darlene Smith indicated that not only is this a huge dataset, but also issues with having student data within that. Instead of trying to share the data, what is the analysis that you want to see?
* Kathryn Summers indicated the need to include more information about student outcomes for different programs. For example, getting jobs, not just attaining a license.
* Darlene indicated that the expectation that we would get that out in round 2, in the part where it goes back to the schools/colleges.
* Paul Moniodis spoke to the use of 100% faculty staff allocation instead of 60/30/10. Undergrad/grad rates used in the analysis don’t add to 1.0. They’re not weighted out of proportion. Everything that went into the model is well documented and transparent for people to review.
* J.C. Weiss noted that the meeting went over time. The next step is school and departmental review. Please share all of this information with your schools.
* Darlene indicated that this information will go first to the academic leadership of each division (Deans, Associate Deans, Chairs, Program Directors) who will share it with smaller groups.

Meeting adjourned at 2:08 pm