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

**October 4th 2017 – 12:00-2:00 pm**

**(DRAFT)**

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

**Guests:** Victoria Reid (EMM), Keiver Jordan (A&F), Antoinette Joseph (A&F), Seyed Mohammadi (A&F), Mark Jacque (EMM), Carey Miller (Provost), Natalie Henning (Admissions), Murray Dalziel (MSB and Dean), Karen Karmiol (Provost), Nicole Marano (Provost), Sally Reed (HR), Rebecca Thompson (CAS), Paul Moniodis (Provost), Roger Hartley (CPA and Dean), Alicia Campbell (Provost), Lucy Holman (Libraries and Dean), Neb Sertsu (Facilities), Haitham Alkhateeb(CAS), Candace Caraco (Provost), Betsy Nix (CAS), Fiona Glade (Provost), Jeffrey Sawyer (CAS)

**Absent:** Eric Stull

**Meeting began at: 12:08 pm**

**1. Logistical Items:**

* Approval of minutes from September 2017: Approved.
* Approval of October 4, 2017 agenda: Need to find a Secretary. Otherwise approved.

**2. President’s Report:**

* **Capital Campaign Update:**

Theresa Silanskis and the Office of Institutional Advancement are doing great work. Two alums are donating a combined $5 million. $2 million is from a Law School alum with interest in scholarships/disadvantaged undergraduates, building upon an earlier donation. $3 million is from Jay Ripley, who is on the UB Foundation Board. His donations will be directed towards MSB and on the day of the announcement of his donation gave $1 million. Clearly word is getting out among alumni on the importance of their gifts.

The competitive environment has changed again. UMCP received an award from the Clark Foundation for $220 million, which will go towards faculty diversity efforts and need-based scholarships. This is a real game changer for College Park and for students in the state who might not have seen College Park as an affordable option. Brown University’s School of Professional Studies is now advertising in this area. We’re going to have to make some strategic and dramatic changes, probably by the end of this semester. We’ll have more on this soon.

* **Commencements – Fall and Spring advisory committee:**

President Schmoke reached out to J.C. Weiss and the president of the Student Government urging them to get together to start talking about forming this committee. J.C. noted that they will be meeting this afternoon in order to move this forward. The hope is that a committee will be formed as soon as possible in order to select a speaker for Spring.

Inviting speakers to campus is becoming increasingly complicated A colleague at Howard spoke with President Schmoke about their convocation, which is far more elaborate than UB and includes regalia, etc. This year the guest speaker was James Comey, former FBI Director. After Mr. Comey was introduced, a group of 40 students stood up in the balcony and shouted him down, focusing on phrases such as “FBI is Anti-Black”, “Comey does not represent the values of Howard” etc. This went on for about 20 minutes until the University Chaplain stood up and asked for calm and asked if people wanted to hear form Comey, and the audience indicated that they did. Controversy is in the air. We cannot predict what is going to happen on these campuses now. President Schmoke is reading all of the comments that people are sending him regarding our Fall Commencement speaker and is trying to respond when he can. But he still believes having DeVos here will be in the best interest of UB and is committed to continuing that invitation.

* **Enrollment status:**

Victoria Reid gave an update. Right now we are at 91% of our enrollment goal. We are down compared to last year, where we were at 93% of goal. They’re start to report out on Spring enrollment numbers but want to make sure they’re looking at the alignment for the whole year

President Schmoke indicated that his predecessor’s enrollment goal of 8000 students is a reach. He believes that we going to be more of a 6000 student university. If that’s the case, then we should start planning in that direction. Before the end of the semester, he will likely present to the community his view of a UB at that size.

* **Budget Update:**

Stephanie Gibson asked President Schmoke about the recently implemented furloughs. She asked the following questions: How you would like us to focus our energies (administrative or teaching) because with furloughs we can’t get all our work done? Also can you please share with us how much money is being saved or recovered by furloughs and how much is being recovered or saved by the pay cuts that admin is saying.

Darlene Smith indicated that we are saving about $950,000 on furloughs. We are saving between $333,000/$335,000 on salary savings, which makes a total of about $1.2 million. President Schmoke indicated that by adding in the hiring/travel freeze and some funds from our reserves, that makes up the $4 million that is filling in our shortage.

Regarding furloughs, Provost Smith added that days must be approved in advance by supervisors. Where you allocate your productivity is an individual decision. The expectation is that furlough days will not occur on teaching days. Many staff are identifying non-peak times, looking at days around holidays and the like.

Jessica Sowa asked for clarification on how this process works considering that faculty members do not punch a clock. Can we give up assessment days? Ultimately, is the expectation that we’re still supposed to be doing everything for less pay?

Sally Reed from HR: At the end of the year, the salary reduction is going to occur whether you record your furlough days or not. For staff, the expectation is that we’re still going to get the work done.

Stephanie Gibson indicated that this explanation makes it sound like this is a pay reduction, not a furlough.

President Schmoke stated that this conversation requires a more thoughtful response, so he’ll prepare one and share it with the community.

John (Not on Sign In Sheet?): What is the legal basis for non-voluntary furloughs? It’s a moot question since we’ll take it any way to save the university. But most of us who are teaching (and most of us) will not change our behavior. But there’s a struggle because we’re still getting the pay cut. Maybe one way of putting this be given the option to actually take the furlough (since we can’t and shouldn’t on teaching days – it would be unfair to our students). For those who can’t there should be a second option, where we say we’re voluntarily giving back our salary and be recognized as such. You’re allowing people to say “Let me give a gift” instead saying “I’m taking time off when I’m not taking time off”. It’s a symbolic thing, but gestures are important.

President Schmoke spoke to the the legal justification for this, though he didn’t have the brief and thus the specifics in front of him. The plan was run by the State Attorney General’s office and a separate counsel for USM. Both agreed that we could do it.

J.C. Weiss added that this is a tough situation and ultimately the students should not suffer.

President Schmoke indicated that the only other option we had to furloughs was layoffs. And we tried to do what we could to keep people working. He couldn’t go deeper into reserves due to commitments to things like the Library renovation and the Post Office site. He will put together a response to the furlough situation to circulate.

David Lingelbach asked if the university would look at a return of the furlough days if we go into healthier financial times.

President Schmoke indicated that he did something like this as Mayor, where over time furloughs were “given back” in terms of added vacation time and the like. He’ll investigate that option for us.

David Lingelbach also noted that many of us are kind of assuming that this furlough situation is not going away, because we have a $4 million structural deficit and no solution.

President Schmoke said that this will not happen. We will address this structural problem and make some dramatic realignment. The university will not look the same in FY2019 as we do now. He hopes furloughs will be the exception, not the rule.

3. **UFS President’s Report & Discussion:**

* **Charges for the University Committees:**

Stephanie Gibson indicated that she sent out information regarding this before the meeting. These charges are for the wider University committees, formerly populated in the “Noah’s Ark” format (two from each department etc.). This method didn’t help us accomplish much, so the committee structure was revamped. After a call for initiatives, the GSC met last month and approved those charges. The idea is that we should reach out to people in our areas who interested in those initiatives. The committees will work on the specific programs/goals and when they’re done, the work is done for the year. Please recruit people in your organization who are interested and report it to Stephanie so they can get to work ASAP.

These are really meaty charges and we really need people to work on these committees. Please make these known to your faculty and make them known so we can populate these committees within the next week. The idea is to get the appropriate people on the committees. If no one is interested in serving, don’t send anyone. We need people who are interested and who will be involved.

The committees are:

Culture and Diversity

* + Develop a plan to recruit, promote, and retain diverse faculty
  + Create a University Diversity plan
  + Responsible people: Shelia Burkhalter, Darlene Smith.

Facilities Committee

* + Develop a plan to repurpose the Learning Commons.
  + Examine uses for postal site.
  + Examine and make recommendations regarding appropriate use of classroom space.
  + Responsible person: Neb Sertsu.

Work Life Committee

* + Assess possibilities for AY calendar farther out (18-24 months)
  + Assess strategies for work force flexibility
  + Evaluate and make recommendation about having an ombudsperson
  + Improve communication of policies and clarify areas of responsibility for department chairs and staff supervisors. Develop training for incoming chairs/supervisors.
  + Responsible people: Mary Maher or Sally Reed.
* **UFS Committee charges, membership updates:**

Only two committees sent out revised charges (APC and Work-Life). Stephanie will send a separate document out with the charges compared to original so we can talk about it at the next meeting.

Stephanie circulated the update to the UFS committee membership changes that needed to be voted on. Honors Council and Grad Council both would like a rep from the Libraries added to their membership. The Council on Research… would like to change their library representation structure. In addition to one representative elected by LFS and one representative appointed by the director of Langsdale and the Law Libraries. The UFS voted on whether or not to adopt the three proposal. **PASSED – See Action Report.**

* **Policy items for APC:**

Nothing to add.

* **Spirit week resolution:**

J.C. Weiss indicated that the staff senate is asking us to pass a resolution on Spirit Week, which is going on right now. He proposed that the University Faculty Senate declare that the first week of October will be Spirit Week, in observance of the first day of classes on October 1, 1925.

David Lingelbach asked, as a procedural question, why couldn’t we send this out for an electronic vote beforehand since we’re already mid-Sprit Week. J.C. indicated that he was trying to limit electronic votes. The UFS voted on adopting this resolution. **PASSED – See Action Report.**

* **Strategic Plan (SPBC) feedback:**

J.C. Weiss indicated that the SPBC hosted two Town Halls this week (one on Monday and one on Tuesday), led by Catherine Andersen. The SPBC also has nine pages of feedback from the online form.

Stephanie Gibson asked if there is a deadline for feedback.

J.C. related that they would like feedback sooner than later, though we did say end of the month. Also if you complete the online survey, the SPBC can’t follow up on questions if you don’t send your name. You can send emails to either J.C., Catherine, or Ann Cotten separately if you would like to follow up on any questions or concerns. J.C. and his colleagues will also gather together some of the questions and send out the questions and their answers to the UB community. J.C. also noted that he and his colleagues are meeting with the various Senates. They want feedback since this will all go into the long-term planning that President Schmoke mentioned in his earlier remarks.

* **Commencement speaker (CAS resolution):**

Stephanie Gibson sent the resolution out to the UFS and read it aloud.

*Resolution regarding invitation to Secretary Betsy DeVos to speak at Fall 2017 UB Commencement*

Whereas the University of Baltimore is currently in an enrollment and budget crisis and the publicity resulting from having Secretary DeVos speak may well cause fewer new students to enroll and current students to leave UB,

Whereas UB is currently in the midst of a re-branding effort and the fallout from people connecting Secretary DeVos to the University of Baltimore will seriously tarnish our brand,

Whereas UB prides itself on reaching out, specifically, to both students of color and students from non-traditional educational backgrounds and Secretary DeVos’ policies reduce access to education to those particular populations,

Whereas UB is a public institution and Secretary DeVos’ policies specifically reduce access and support to public education,

Whereas Secretary DeVos has specifically indicated she feels no groups are in need of protection, including disabled, female, Muslim, black, LGBT, Asian, Latino, Indigenous or immigrant students and policies reflecting this directly and negatively impact much of UB’s student population,

Whereas Secretary DeVos indicated her wish to slash education programs that support the neediest among us,

Whereas Secretary DeVos’ intentions appear to show a disregard for public education in general,

Whereas Secretary DeVos has announced her lack of support for provisions regarding sexual assault embedded in Title IX,

Whereas her appearance at a UB commencement is likely to produce protest at a time that should be filled with joy and celebration for our students who have worked harder than at any time in their lives, and

Whereas in the spirit of diversity and openness to all ideas that should infuse education we recommend that Secretary DeVos be invited to speak at an event specifically designed to elicit dialogue and healthy debate,

Therefore the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences requests that Secretary DeVos’ invitation to speak at the Fall 2017 commencement be rescinded.

Stephanie Gibson indicated that she understands that President Schmoke will not rescind the invitation and also invited the other Senates to join in a similar resolution.

4. **Provost’s Report:**

* **University committees:**

In particular, Provost Smith indicated that there is a strategic intent to move University forward with the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty. This is key for her and President Schmoke. They want to move on this work quickly so it can be in place in time for next year’s recruiting season. Engaged faculty are needed for the Culture and Diversity committee, and the other two committees, and asked that people join if they are interested.

* **Strategic Program Analysis, next steps:**

Each of the schools is working on this, bringing in additional information. 14 individuals will convene on a Friday and Saturday in November to review the preliminary recs from the Deans on the programs in their respective schools. This group includes the Dean of each school plus a designee. Victoria Reid and Natalie from Enrollment will also join, along with Catherine Andersen and Provost Smith. This retreat will be an intense two days to look at the work that has been done and possible changes from that work.

Kathryn Summers stated that CAS still has questions on the methodology and the replicability of the methodology. Is there the same plan to run the same cost-benefit analysis in the area of administrative costs, which at this point seems a very vague or murky part of this study? Also, the study says that it is going to focus on contribution margin for the programs but the ranking was based on revenue. She and her colleagues re-organized the table and this produces very different results.

Provost Smith: The data set developed came from 4 different data systems at the University. There’s sensitive information within the data set (student and faculty information) and thus we can’t share the meta-data set across the university.

Paul Moniodis: He will hold a workshop and take the live data and with the parties there and go through the process and respond to any and all questions on how each metric is developed. He will work out the logistics of this this afternoon. There will be two workshops – one for presentation and then, after the participants have analyzed it, they can come back with questions. It will be before the end of the month.

Provost Smith indicated that the workshops need to happen next week to allow for turnaround before the retreat. She also wanted clarification on what was being requested in terms of the methodology.

Greg Walsh indicated that they want to better understand the ten points that were displayed. They want to know how that information was derived and what are the definitions.

Kathryn Summers asked that they be allowed to see the queries used even if the data behind it can’t be disclosed.

J.C. Weiss indicated that this work ideally needs to be done before the retreat. He also asked that we not omit qualitative data that this research doesn’t capture.

Kathryn Summers indicated that we cannot treat the data already shared as authoritative if it’s not transparent and replicable. They want to know which databases were used and which queries were run. The administrative costs generated in this project are very murky, especially how they were generated.

Greg Walsh reiterated that in the spreadsheet that was reported, there are headings that aren’t clear and need to be defined. One of our points is that there is administrative data and the way it’s applied you would assume it is equal across programs. But when you look at the data, there’s a significant range in how it was applied.

David Lingelbach raised the point that the administration is going to ask the university community by the end of this year to do some difficult things. And if you want people to buy in, you need to be transparent about things. He is not impressed by how this data is being shared with the community, noting that it was differentially distributed. He further indicated that a great number of the faculty are researchers who can figure out datasets without help from other people. He suggested that even if we have a password protected access to PDFs so we can look at the data and have intelligent conversations.

Provost Smith: As to distribution, Excel files were sent to the Deans to be shared with the Leadership teams. It was assumed that the Excel files would be shared with whoever wanted them. If that hasn’t been done, that was the intent all along that anyone could have access to those files. 9 page file. It was not intentional that people would not have access to these files.

David Lingelbach suggested that it’s easier to do these things if we’re open and collaborative from the start. That to him is what makes sense.

Provost Smith related that she spent two hours with each Leadership team to go over the Excel file with the understanding that each Leadership team would share the information with their constituents.

Kathryn Summers indicated that not all faculty have the Excel spreadsheets and, furthermore, spreadsheets aren’t correct. Why not just share the queries?

Paul Moniodis stated that the queries are very long SQL codes that comes from OTS. He did not feel that going back and trying to debug the University’s operation systems to make sure that things are being properly pulled was a worthwhile effort at this time. Kathryn Summers repeated her request that the queries be shared. Paul reiterated that he doesn’t feel that this will be a route that will be beneficial in the timeframe or satisfy the questions in this timeframe. He has to go to OTS and ask them and see how long it would take to get these queries.

Provost Smith requested that a description of the queries, and the queries themselves if possible, be shared.

Stephanie Gibson also reiterated Greg’s request for the definitions and agreed with David Lingelbach in that the administration is asking us to make serious decisions about our programs and not much time and you need to get everyone on board.

Betsy Nix added that she and her colleagues can’t replicate the instructional costs for a particular program (History) and can’t understand why a program has over $200,000 of administrative costs. They want the formula that was used to calculate instructional costs.

Greg Walsh stated that he hopes that this conversation will lead us down a path that shows us that we need to rethink how we gather and query data on this campus.

J.C. Weiss thanked everyone for their suggestions and asked that they send any additional suggestions or question to him or Provost Smith.

Provost Smith will send out information on the aforementioned workshops tomorrow and clarified that the workshops can be attended by anyone who is interested.

5. **Gen Ed Council report:**

* Jeffrey Sawyer presented, noting that Gen Ed Council is meeting twice a month and that they sent an update, which was circulated by Stephanie Gibson before the meeting.

The Council is working to develop a course description and student learning outcomes for the capstone course. This will be circulated to the faculty shortly. They have reviewed their charge and he will send it on to Stephanie. Assessment for this term is Social and Behavioral Sciences Gen Ed. All faculty have been notified. This year the Council will do two batches of approval for Gen Edand grad requirement course applications. October 25th is the next deadline. The Council is also working on policies for students who are contesting if they’ve received the proper credit for Gen Ed or graduation requirements. Fiona Glade indicated they receive a couple dozen requests of this nature a month.

Jeffrey Sawyer indicated that he and faculty who teach Gen Ed are concerned that the aforementioned strategic program analysis doesn’t treat Gen Ed as a program at all. Thus the analysis gives a distorted view of costs and benefits. And it treats the schools very inequitably. For example, MSB has 7 Gen Ed courses this term and 7 grad requirements, CPA 6 and 16, and CAS 88 and 35. This also doesn’t include the writing courses. So the burden of these courses fall disproportionately on CAS and he and his colleagues do not see how that’s reflected in the data set when we’re considering productivity.

6. **Master Plan Update:**

* Neb Sertu presented. The last time he spoke was at the end of the Spring Semester. At that time, he had a final draft of the plan completed reviewed by USM, stakeholders, and was prepared to present to the Board of Regents in September. We have a surplus of space. The Plan focuses on bringing everyone up to the core of the campus, so up to Oliver (Post Office and Library). Not only do we have a surplus of classrooms, we need to right size classroom and put in the right infrastructure so they can be best used by faculty. All of the data was based on 6400 students, while the Master Plan is a 10 year look ahead and was focused on the end goal of 7500 students. And even with that data we had a surplus of space. So clearly the data isn’t relevant anymore. We notified Regents of the need to update the report. Once they have updated enrollment, will look again at what to do with our surplus of space. Even with 6500 students, we are at 170% space.

There are a number of things we can do now. We have the surplus and we’ll continue to have it. Most of our classroom space, but it’s just not quality space. They’re not sized for the occupant loads – like the LC with 75 tiered seats vs. classes with 10 students. We need to create active learning classrooms and it’s his hope that the Facilities Committee that comes together will give faculty input on where the classrooms should be, what they should look like, taking those unideal classrooms offline, and think about use for the future.

We are in a holding pattern for 3-6 months on the plan, but that doesn’t stop us on making decision now. When Langsdale moves back, 75% of the learning commons will be available. We need to consider the real long term use for that building by either reallocating space or rethinking the space as a whole. We can make small savings now that will add up.

Regarding the Postal Site, construction started mid-September on the replacement site. Construction will be done a year from now. At that point there will be a transfer of deeds and the University can consider what to do with the Postal Site space.

Greg Walsh asked if the Facilities Committee will also look at times/slots/the way we run evening classes. Neb Sertu indicated that we have the data, so that’s certainly a possibility. The current draft of the report is up and gives room usage by data. For example, Fridays few classrooms are used. So yes, the committee can look at optimizing use as a whole.

Roger Hartley asked if we will look at spaces for things such as Centers (like the Schafer Centers). CPA is out of space for offices and wants to stay together – both faculty spaces and Centers. He wants to see that all on the table and find something that works effectively.

7. **Marketing, branding, and enrollment (census and strategy) – what urgent steps being taken**

**right now?**

* Victoria Reid gave a quick recruitment update to show what we’re doing on the admissions and marketing side. She wanted to give everyone a sense of what they did coming into the fall and how we’re moving into the spring and next fall.

We are in transition into a new agency and once that agency is fully on board it will accelerate. Also need to incorporate the Ologie recommendations. They will send out the external stakeholder Ologie survey in the next few weeks. In November they will work on brand strategy and concepts. After that, they’ll test and get the results and begin training the broader community for a March roll out. Not everything will change on March 1st. This is a gradual roll out and with a focus on enrollment marketing. It will take a couple of months if not the full year to really roll it out.

Admissions: Outreach Strategy: They broadened the acquisition of leads to a more regional aspect, which has also impacted the location of the fairs that they’re attending. They’re focusing on transfers and doing a variety of visits, going to community colleges, bringing students here to campus, doing pre-transfer counseling at the community colleges, etc. The Partnership Luncheon is set for 2/14.

UMUC: UMUC is obviously different from us. They’re started making bigger incursion, though always there at transfer and graduate level. They transfer more credit than us, etc. But there opportunities with audiences that we can look at – such as International students, military, and some of our programmatic accreditations.

The new Transfer and Career Counselor has gone to all of the community colleges over the past couple of months to acquaint or reacquaint. They hired two senior counselors with great experience. They are purchasing names and augmenting our database and are combining our graduate and our transfer info sessions. They’re working with Transferology, which allows students to input their own courses (especially out of state students) to see what it would look like at UB. They circulated Recruitment Brochure to over 15K gatekeepers and implemented the Cappex-free application.

Coordination: A lot of in-house call campaigns to students submitting FASFA. They want to have that engagement tracking more centralized. Enrollment Collaboration and Communication – Assistant Deans are on it and providing the feedback.

Kathryn Summers made the case that if we’re going to invest scholarship money in graduate students, it would be far more valuable as research assistantships through program directors. Then the money is invested in the student developing a relationship with faculty, which has a bigger long-term impact. Victoria Reid indicated they haven’t gone this route due to the part-time and evening nature of the programs/student needs. Kathryn Summers replied that we can be flexible on this.

Jeffrey Ian Ross indicated that this is an impressive list of activities towards recruitment. Are 20% of the activities responsible for 80% of the recruiting? Can you tell us which activities are the most effective and how would you determine what are the most effective?

Victoria Reid related that they can tell that digital media is effective, but the impact is hard to track. Some of the aforementioned activities are going to look higher for conversion rates, because they’ve already decided to go (like the info sessions). Agency efforts for freshmen haven’t worked, but work better for graduates.

President Schmoke related that we still have confusion about what we want to be. When he started, community colleges asked where we’ve been. We re-committed, but other colleges are going after what used to be our bread and butter – like community colleges and veterans. This is a hard question to answer because we’ve been shifting as an institution and thus shifting our focus.

Rajesh Mirani asked that if UMUC is everything we’re not, why are we losing market share to them? Are we going after the wrong market share? Is there a fundamental mismatch that wasn’t there between who we are and what we are aiming to do? Victoria Reid suggested the UMUC speaks the same audience we do in terms of adult learners and they’ve had a strong scholarship push. This trend of UMUC and colleges like Towson taking over market share didn’t happen overnight. Also, there’s a segment of students who do not want to complete it face to face, so they go to UMUC. They’re slightly cheaper, but it’s more about the awareness and completion scholarships.

Rajesh Mirani asked if we should we be doing what they’re doing? How do we play upon the strengths that are unique to us or are we just looking at one side of things? Victoria Reid indicated that we need to better articulate the benefits of coming to UB in terms of transfer credits etc. We need to talk about the acceleration into the master more. As we refine those pathways, we can talk about it more. J.C. Weiss noted that we have schools and programs that are nationally accredited and that should make us a place of choice and a quality choice. We can say the same thing, but that’s all they can say. We truly represent quality education in a way that UMUC can’t say they do. Are there other ways to differentiate ourselves or does the market not care? Victoria Reid reiterated the impact of the scholarships, the fact that they do have rolling semesters and start date, and that they’re online.

President Schmoke stated that Rajesh Mirani has a point – we need to emphasize our strengths, why we are unique, and why you chose UB over other schools. This needs to be a succinct message and more than stating that we’re better than UMUC.

Roger Hartley suggested that UMUC is speaking louder with marketing dollars. Our new branding will help, but programmatically as well. How are students learning about us? Is it the impact of the advisor who, when the student is looking to transfer? Do we need to be building relationships at a deeper level? Victoria Reid indicated that relationships are certainly a part of this and noted that the impact of the transfer counselor and pre-transfer efforts. She also suggested the positive impact of working together with advisors from the individual schools at UB.

Victoria Reid gave a very brief rundown of the marketing efforts. We generated 12% increase in leads and doubled leads for MSB and saw the impact there. We need to do a better job on transfers. She gave example of some of the efforts that they’re doing on social media, how they reached out to JMore to advertise the Sunday admission session, which they’ll repeat in the spring. They’re focusing more on local and program-specific campaigns. Stephanie Gibson will circulate the slides.

8. **Items for CUSF / CUSF update:**

* Julie Simon spoke. She noted that CUSF passed a joint resolution with staff and student senates asking for an ombudsman person on each campus. This was passed on to the Chancellor. CUSF also received a presentation on supporting retired faculty on campuses.

CUSF is putting together working committees for the rest of the year. She’s looking at academic dishonesty policies across the campuses in particular.

J.C. Weiss noted that the Chair of UB foundation will be here at the start of the next meeting.

**Meeting adjourned at 1:56 pm.**