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

**November 1st, 2017 – 12:00-2:00 pm**

**(DRAFT)**

**Attendees:** JC Weiss (UFS President and MSB), Stephanie Gibson (UFS VP and CAS), Jessica Sowa (CPA), Irvin Brown (CPA), Rajesh Mirani (MSB), Julie Simon (CAS and CUSF), Kathryn Summers (CAS), Greg Walsh (CAS), Darlene Smith (Provost), Michael Hayes (Law), Cassandra Jones Havard (Law), Mortimer Sellers (Law), Mike Kiel (Libraries), David Lingelbach (MSB), Ben Wright (CPA), Tara Richards (CPA), Maggie Dull (Libraries)

**Guests:** Catherine Andersen (Provost), Candace Caraco (Provost), Aaron Wallis (CPA), Barbara Aughenbaugh (Admin/Finance), Michael Shochet (Libraries), Al Gourrier (CPA), Chris Spencer (CAS), Mary Maher (HR), Alex Davis (OTS), Fiona Glade (Provost), Anita Harwood (OGPA), Suanne Tabor (OGPA), Monique Clark (Libraries), Karen Karmiol (Provost), Nicole Marano (Provost), Sally Reed (HR), Marilyn Oblak (MSB), Laurie Harow (Law), Neb Sertsu (FMCP), Mark Jacque (EMM), Victoria Reid (EMM), Betsy Nix (CAS), Aaron Weichaus (CAS), Ronald Weich (Law), Haitham Alkhateeb (CAS),

**Absent:** Eric Stull, Kurt Schmoke

Called to order at 12:09 pm

1. **Logistical items:**
	* **Approval of minutes from October 2017:** Approved.
	* **Approval of November 1, 2017 agenda:** Added a discussion of the Campus ID Policy. Agenda approved with aforementioned addition.
	* **Elect new UFS Secretary:** Only nominee is Mike Kiel (Libraries). No other nominees were brought forward. Mike Kiel is elected by acclamation. **SEE ACTION ITEM**
2. **UB Foundation Chair Tom** **Crawford:**
	* Tom Crawford (MBA ’91) became Chair of the UB Foundation Board in June 2017. Professionally, he is currently the Mid-Atlantic Market President for BBVA Compass, a commercial bank headquartered in Houston.

Crawford visited the meeting to talk about the Foundation’s Capital Campaign. President Kurt Schmoke committed to bringing up the University’s endowment to $100 million by 2025. Work on the Capital Campaign began a year ago, with an eye towards capitalizing on the upcoming 100-year anniversary of the University. Crawford noted the budget pressures that are impacting institutions throughout the University System of Maryland (USM) and which are causing a greater need to supplement our budgets. More than ever UB needs a bigger nest egg and the income stemming from said nest egg. Our current endowment stands at around $48 million, meaning we need to raise in excess of $50 million to achieve our goal. The University has never undertaken a campaign this big, nor have we traditionally focused on endowment campaigns. Previous capital campaigns were focused around places, like the John and Frances Angelos Law Center, which became a signature building for UB and the surrounding area. Fundraising for an endowment is notably more difficult than fundraising for specific projects and buildings. This current Campaign is also focused on the challenging task of generating more unrestricted funds. The Foundation is getting some guidance from USM to move forward on this campaign. Crawford noted that all of the USM universities will be launching new campaigns over the next few years, so in a sense we’ll be competing against other institutions in the system, so it will be competitive. However, the Foundation has a jump start on some of the other institutions, as it has been working with a consultant etc. Currently the foundation is working to identify what the University is doing that is different and innovative, initiatives that philanthropists will be excited about and want to support. Stephanie Gibson emailed a brief summary of the case studies/possible projects that the Deans have compiled and the Foundation will share the full draft when it is complete.

1. **UFS President’s report** **& discussion:**
	* **Campus ID Policy:** Ronald Weich, Dean of the Law School, spoke on this matter. He served, along with Sam Tress (Chief of the University Police), on a taskforce that sought to address the issue of the “openness” of University buildings. There is a concern on campus that that Campus Police do not know who is in the building – it can be difficult to tell who is a student/staff/faculty member and who is a visitor/member of the public. **Before the policy, students/staff/faculty were required to obtain a Bee Card, but were not required to display them. The system for visitors to obtain temporary Bee Cards is not in place for all buildings/visitors. Thus, the Campus Police are reluctant to approach people on assumptions or hunches due to the necessary very open nature of our buildings. Per an email from President Schmoke at the start of the semester, those of us who have Bee Cards must wear them. The University is working on various ways to ensure all visitors get some sort of ID. With that in place, Campus Police will be able to approach people without Bee Card or temporary ID and ask them to leave after designated open hours.** This is a big change, especially with the inclusion of ID for visitors. Weich noted that a large number of public buildings, especially government buildings, have some sort of similar system in place.

Rajesh Mirani asked if there is a proposal to add surveillance/cameras to monitor people entering and exiting. Weich noted that while the committee had a number of ideas for ways to spend money – turnstiles, video, etc. – there is simply a lack of funding for technological or architectural changes. The ID policy is a lower cost way towards increased security.

Stephanie Gibson asked who was on the taskforce. Weich noted that in addition to himself and Chief Tress, all units were given the opportunity to provide participation. He can provide a list of everyone on the taskforce.

**Gibson asked Weich if, in developing the policy, they had addressed the issues/concern brought up by law school. Weich noted that there is an issue with undocumented clients coming to the law school for clinics, etc. Chief Tress proposed a system where the clinic could provide a list of the clients who are coming in that day. The taskforce noted that we will have to make exceptions to the policy – such as having a large event like a theatrical performance in the Wright Theater.**

JC Weiss noted that buildings such as Law and LAP have people on the front desk. How does this policy impact the libraries? Weich said that currently contracted security guards sit in LAP and Law – this was in place before taskforce. Since they’re in place, those buildings can implement the temporary ID program. The fact that Law and Langsdale have libraries isn’t a change or an issue – we’re a public university and there are reasons for people to be in all of our buildings. If you want to use any of the libraries, such as Law, you indicate this when you check in Law or the Learning Commons. This system isn’t foolproof, but the taskforce believes the sign-in procedure will have an impact and will address the notion that this place is open and we have people using the bathrooms and showers in Law, for example.

**JC Weiss asked about the plan for buildings that lack a staffed desk. Weich responded that those buildings would have signage that direct people to the Bee Card office or to another building to obtain some form of temporary ID.**

[Maggie couldn’t see who this was on the other side of the table] asked if the taskforce obtained a quote to technology on doors for buildings? Like IDs tapping, etc. Weich indicated that such an effort was deemed outside the scope of the taskforce.

Provost Smith added that the first step in this process was to get the ID policy on the books. As the policy is rolled out, the focus will be on buildings that have experienced issues in the past. **She indicated the need to get the entire UB community to wear their IDs and allow the UB Police to have the authority to request ID without fear of being accused of profiling. Smith noted that UB’s campus is the safest campus in the USM. Work on the policy and related activities is not because we’ve had a spike in crime, but is a proactive act. She also reiterated Weich’s observation that in many organizations in Baltimore and the surrounding areas, ID policies like this are the norm.**

Kathryn Summers spoke to say that she supports a policy that asks community members to carry their IDs, but sees the leap to have people wear their IDs all the time or sign in as potentially offensive. Places that do that are those that have security risks. How much is our security at risk if we don’t do it? What does the data say? Weich said that they’ve had thefts from the Law buildings. Summers countered that all of the buildings have experienced thefts. She did not see the necessity for the current ID policy as being expressed and she does not want to support it.

Weich stated that faculty and staff have expressed concerns regarding safety and a desire for more security or sense of who is in the building**. If you would like to provide additional feedback on the policy, you can do so at the Policy Guide site:** [**https://www.ubalt.edu/secure/policy\_review/**](https://www.ubalt.edu/secure/policy_review/) **(UB Login Required)**

JC Weiss shared with the group that UMB has had this type of a policy for years. This is part of life in an urban university.

Provost Smith stated that the purpose of the policy is to prevent a major incident – want to be proactive and not have to react to a change.

* + **UFS Committee revised charges (Stephanie Gibson):** Stephanie Gibson noted that in the draft circulated before the meeting, the italics were somehow removed from the Gen Ed charge, making it difficult to see the changes made. Gen Ed committee member and Assistant Provost for Undergraduate Studies and Academic Affairs Fiona Glade indicated that the committee made some general edits, but did not make any changes to the charge itself. The major change was to address that there is now an Assistant Provost for Undergraduate Studies (Fiona) and the edits made the collaboration and communication between the committee and her office.

Gibson noted that most of the changes to the charges are minor. Faculty Work Life changes are more significant. No one from Work Life was present at the meeting to help elaborate. Gibson noted that she is still waiting for the revised charge from the Academic Support Committee. Their charge overlaps with some committees, so the editing is taking more time. Monique Clark, librarian and committee member, noted that they were close to finalizing a draft and could circulate it after the meeting.

Gibson moved that the UFS approve the revisions as circulated. Approved. **SEE ACTION ITEM**

* + **Faculty Appeals Committee:**  JC Weiss noted for the minutes that the Faculty Appeals committee will be convened. The committee is autonomous and confidential in their deliberations and then will make a recommendation to the President. While the committee is not often called, he did note that this is the second time 18 months that the committee has been convened.
1. **Provost’s Report (Provost Smith):**
* **UB Foundation Capital Campaign:**  Provost Smith, following up on the comments by Tom Crawford, said that they will circulate white papers that were created by each Division for possible projects/initiatives that would appeal to donors. The drafts will be tested with donors and refined. She noted that our consultant on the Campaign, Jim Langley, suggested that significant philanthropic donors are looking to help fund initiatives that solve societal needs. By linking our initiatives to broader society needs we are more likely to succeed. President Schmoke, in the past several months, has raised $5 million. President Schmoke is out working on gaining additional funding and sends his regrets for missing today’s meeting, but we all understand why he’s not here. If you have more ideas for initiatives, Smith suggests you speak to your Dean and they’re very happy to more well-crafted, well-articulated, strategic projects to move the University forward.

Stephanie Gibson indicated that she just sent out the one-page distillation of the current ideas to the UFS membership.

* **Budget Update:** Provost Smith referred the attendees to an email on this topic sent from her office last week. **All aspects of our operations are being analyzed – academic as well as operations. Deans are coming up with creative ideas for their areas. Smith discussed the Shared Services Oversight Committee – which is looking at administrative activities, identifying places for cost cutting and eliminating redundancies, and developing shared service centers. There is not a department or unit that isn’t deeply involved in these conversations. The goal is to have a plan in place by February 1 to share with the community. There are multiple drivers to enrollment and thus budget issues, which will require a multi-dimensional response. The plan will mostly likely be implemented in late spring in time for the FY19 budget cycle.**

David Lingelbach asked for more detail on the 10 groups she mentioned and who is working on this issue. Smith noted that the Steering Committee just met this week and doesn’t want to be premature in announcing the workgroup membership. These workgroups are small – two or three people the most. Smith noted that the goal is to eliminate redundancies. In some cases, there might not necessarily be cost savings but rather there will be improved productiveness. Smith gave the example of how each Division has staff working on communications. UB is very decentralized – are we decentralized to the point where we’ve increased our costs? Could we achieve more effectiveness in things like marketing with a shared service model? The small workgroups are looking at things like this right now.

Lingelbach asked about the policy that they’re looking at/that is guiding this effort. Smith noted that this project is a jigsaw puzzle. The University doesn’t want to do what they’ve done before – which is a set percentage cut across the board. This kind of across the board bloodletting hasn’t worked. The work this time will be far more focused – more like wielding a scalpel – in order to see where we can cut without harming the institutional goals of financial stability and enrolment growth. All of the decisions made in this process will be based on these goals.

**Lingelbach noted that then the goals of financial stability and enrollment growth are the policy. Smith agreed. She also noted the ongoing issue in the variability among our undergraduate students in terms of admission standards. We have the greatest variance between the lowest quartile and the highest quartile of students. She will be back here next next month with a proposal to incrementally raise admission standards (over three years). The University is willing to improve the academic level of the institution if we have to take a short term hit.**

Lingelbach noted that Smith’s recent memo asked all units for these 5/10/15% scenarios. Isn’t this the old way of cutting that we just discussed? Provost Smith noted that the memo also asked all units to examine their operations and ask what is central/what is important. Some units might ultimately not be cut if that something needs to be enhanced or maintained but the University if facing a $4 million deficit. She noted that 15% is a stretch and part of asking that is to really engage people creatively to see what that might look like in terms of how we do business, how we organize, and to get units to start talking to each other. In other words, the 15% was intended to push the imagination.

Greg Walsh noted that student success is also a part of financial stability and enrollment. Provost Smith agreed.

Walsh asked about the chart that was sent out in the memo. In FY13 UB had an Operating Revenue of $106 million, which jumped to $111 million in FY17. Yet during this time there is a decrease in enrollment. How does this add up? JC Weiss wondered if salary increases from the state in that period of time could have an impact.

Barbara Aughenbaugh noted that there isn’t a short answer for this, but that factors such as salary increases and tuition increase account for this change. **Provost Smith reminded everyone about the Budget page (when you log into MyUB Portal). You can find all of the data on expenditures here. Aughenbaugh noted that in this portal you can also drill down by Division and function. You can also look at salaries across Divisions and Functions. Anyone with further questions is welcome to email her.**

Mortimer Sellers noted a pervasive theme in not just this conversation but our work - financial stability and enrollment growth. Both depend heavily upon a third, yet unstated goal, which is excellence. We’ve lost touch with the fact that this – excellence or excellent at education – is our primary goal. He noted that President Schmoke says that our goal is to choose things that we are excellent at and be excellent at them. Professionalism is another goal. Sellers further noted that the two goals of financial stability and enrolment growth are not necessarily inspiring goals for donors. Rather, we should say that we are an excellent place, and choose to be so. In doing so we can perhaps inspire ourselves as we strive towards excellence.

Provost Smith noted that we, as a University, adhere to principles of academic excellence – sometimes an unspoken truth. She indicated the previous discussion on raising the admission standards and focusing on quality. The consensus is that we have concerns about academic excellence and fear that we’ve made it a secondary or tertiary thought. In the new strategic plan, we will see the principle of academic excellent reinforced.

* **Online Taskforce:** The purpose of this taskforce is to expand and improve on our online delivery. **Though we are cash strapped, we are going to look at vendors and see if we can engage with them, though** **we will not lose control over content or curriculum**. There are options where the vendor becomes a marketing arm, providing an upfront investment in the marketing in order to get a cut of future revenue. We need to look at every possibility. **Smith further addressed a misperception that if we were to go with a vendor that we are outsourcing online program development and delivery and that is not the intent and not what many other universities do. We are not trying to be a for-profit but we do need help in marketing and building brand awareness.**

Julie Simon brought up the issue that it takes much longer to develop online content for teaching than in-person content. She asked how this additional effort will be compensated in terms of faculty time if we are moving towards offering more online. Provost Smith said that this is one of the considerations of the taskforce.

Jessica Sowa indicated that there are serious problems in working with vendors. Many of our online programs are full and all the marketing in the world won’t help full programs. Provost Smith replied that if you’re exploding at the seams, then you have an opportunity to invest and grow even more and how can a vendor help with that? Re-invest back into faculty to support a growing program. Sowa related the example of UNC Chapel Hill and their model of TA’s teaching classes. Smith said that we don’t want to delivery MOOCs and make that our version of online. We believe in quality education and that will never be sacrificed.

**Stephanie Gibson asked who is on the taskforce. Catherine Andersen noted that the participation request came through the Deans. Gibson asked why it didn’t come through governance. Provost Smith stated that they reached out through the Deans to see who had expertise and interest.** The thought was that the Deans would be the quickest way/have the best knowledge of who should participate. Gibson was concerned that this process started without any faculty input, though she is glad that there will be faculty input. Even though that we’re not buying a vendor for content, anything online is related to teaching and thus faculty need to be in on the ground floor.

Smith noted that the process began with a small group that had Deans involved to see if we wanted to explore this. This was a high level, strategic conversation that is now expanding in terms of participation. There was no intent to keep faculty out, but rather this is the process that emerged as they tried to determine if this effort had legs Many of these ideas tested out as we were developing the strategic plan.

Roger Hartley, Dean of CPA, noted that at the initial meeting of the Deans they explored issues relating to online education. For example, CPA has units that are interested in putting programs online. What would it take to get a program online? What resources are we missing at the University? At the end of that meeting, there was a list of questions for which they needed answers and realized that faculty and staff need to be involved in answering those questions. Hartley wanted to assure attendees that the only thing that came out of it were those questions and the taskforce is to help answer those questions.

Rajesh Mirani thanked Hartley for this explanation. Mirani also noted that there is a great deal of variability in the academic units with online teaching. While CPA’s concerns might be how to get things online, MSB has been doing it for 18 plus years, so they want to refine existing work. Mirani also asked for an example of a vendor and the value proposition they may provide. Provost Smith did not want to provide an example at this time as they haven’t done the research/formed the taskforce that will investigate this issue further. She did note that she’s spoken with other universities regarding their experiences with vendors and there’s a great deal of variability in the kinds of services that can be provided and thus the revenue sharing. However, Smith felt that it wouldn’t be prudent to share information that hasn’t really been explored.

Catherine Andersen added that Paul Walsh (CELTT) left in January and Terry Ross retired. Yet we are still looking to upgrade Sakai. We need to look at how we can best support what we’re already doing.

**David Lingelbach asked Provost Smith if she would welcome faculty who are willing to volunteer to be on these workgroups. Provost Smith said yes, indicating that this is why they reached out through the Deans. Any and all interested faculty are welcome.**

Marilyn Oblak asked if the online taskforce and online advisory taskforce were the same thing. Catherine Andersen noted that two things started to merge into one. Natalie Malm, acting head of CELTT, wanted an ongoing advisory board that included at least one faculty member experienced in online teaching and one who wasn’t as familiar. This group could be asked to join the larger online taskforce. Provost Smith noted that the deans have been asked to provide suggestions of faculty members with appropriate expertise to join the online taskforce.

Provost Smith noted that UB has a higher rate of failure in online courses than in face to face. Students aren’t trained to take online courses. What would that kind of training look like? Likewise, there has to be a way to scale faculty development in online learning. Do we set aside funds to bring in professional trainers in online teaching to help? These issues would be the focus of the advisory board, while the taskforce is looking at more strategic issues. Catherine Andersen noted that other institutions have requirements for students before they can take online courses. Greg Walsh reminded everyone that in 2014 there was an e-learning document created as part of a committee that reported to CUSF.

1. **President’s** **report:**
	* **Strategic Plan (SPBC):** This update was given by Catherine Andersen. President Schmoke is very enthusiastic about the new plan. The committee closed feedback from the community on Friday and will have this feedback up on the website for review by this Friday (11/3). There’s a great deal of focus in the plan on improving the rigor and excellence of UB. Andersen also noted that President Schmoke wants UB to have within each signature area of excellence a nationally ranked program. Process for defining how we evaluate our strategies. JC Weiss related that there will be a more formal presentation at the December UFS meeting on the plan.
2. **Course Evaluation Committee update**
* Catherine Andersen gave an update. She will send out a list of who is on the committee. The main purpose of the committee was to look at course evaluations and response rate. They investigated the purpose of the evaluations which evolved into how the evaluations are used in Promotion & Tenure and feedback to faculty. The committee discussed biases around evaluations, so the committee felt that the evaluations should only be about 1/3 of the consideration for P&T. They also noted quite a bit of variation among the evaluations across the institution. The committee is working to balance questions that work across the board with college specific questions. Another idea is instead of going to “Rate My Professor”, the University will have faculty evaluations available to students.

Rajesh Mirini asked for clarification on what is meant by 1/3 of the consideration. Andersen noted that this means that the course evaluations should be no more than 1/3 of the total evaluation of the faculty member’s teaching. Stephanie Gibson suggested that 1/3 sounds very high.

The committee will meeting again this coming Tuesday and will report back to UFS next month.

1. **Vice President for Finance Search:** Mary Maher gave a brief update on the search for the new Vice President for Finance. Starting on November 2nd, candidates will come to campus. The committee will send out each day completely anonymous surveys for feedback on our meetings with the candidates. This feedback will be compiled into a report for President Schmoke, which he’ll receive after he’s interviewed the three candidates.
2. **Marketing, branding, and enrollment** – what urgent specific steps are being taken *right now*? – Victoria Reid
* 5544 is the final headcount for the fall. The goal for spring is 5540. UB tends not to get many Freshmen in the spring – mostly transfer and grad students. Right now we are doing well in terms of graduate students but noted that there is a backlog of about 100 transfer applications to review.

Last year and into the summer enrollment efforts focused on specific graduate programs, such as the MBA program. Admissions also moved towards a territory management strategy. They expanded the search and the purchase of names – doubling the prospect pools. Admission is doing calling campaigns, added Sunday sessions, and upgraded staff. Admissions is also doing pre-advising sessions at Montgomery College and hope to expand to include other community colleges.

Reid stated that we are in transition between marketing agencies now. On Friday there will be a meeting between the old and the new agency. We will be working with our new agency to work with Ologie on rolling out the new marketing plan. Between the transition, there will still be radio ads, paid social media, developing video content, such as for Shady Grove and we just ended our military-focused advertising campaign.

Reid noted that Ologie finished the external brand survey. For both internal and external, they had over 1000 responses. The new brand concept will be presented to a core brand group in November and they will reach out to faculty and other groups for feedback in December. They will refine the work through the holidays and begin brand training at the beginning of February. Her staff and Ologie kept up with all of the changes in the strategic plan so there will be alignment there.

David Lingelbach asked for the total enrollment for spring. Reid noted that so far it is 5466, down from last spring. Lingelbach asked how many applications are required for that number of enrollments. Reid noted that our application to enrollment rates are 45% for transfer, 24% for freshman, 38% for grad programs. If you go all the way back to the point of inquiry, our overall rate is 10%. Our inquiry pool is between 15,000 and 16,00, but our prospect pool is much larger than that. In projecting for fall, they are being very realistic on what we can do on the new and the continuing side. The most likely case will have us declining compared to this year, due to some of the pipeline issues. However, there are positive signs on the grad side.

Provost Smith noted that we are trying to reduce how long the transfer evaluation takes so students won’t try to shop elsewhere. Reid indicated a new program whereby if you come in with an associates degree, you’ll be eligible for additional funding since you’re more likely to persist. Catherine Andersen, speaking of persisting, noted a great participation in the 200 level Early Alert program and that we are seeing some great interventions happening.

Mike Kiel asked if the application to enrollment percentages are typical. Reid noted that we are currently a little higher on transfers, but the percentages are based on last year’s data. On grad we are currently at where we are, but on undergrad we’re softer due to pipeline issues. Reid noted that we are close to the 75 percentile median on transfers.

1. **Items for CUSF** **/ CUSF update**

Julie Simon related that at the last CUSF meeting there was a discussion on Title IX and that the System will stay strong on this subject despite what may happen in the federal government. There is a push for more inclusion and diversity among faculty, so graduate students and post-docs can see diversity modeled and so we can attract more diverse faculty candidates. CUSF will meet here at UB on December 14th and it is an inclusive meeting.

Stephanie Gibson attended the CUSF Senate Chairs meeting (held once a semester).
The Chancellor talked at some length and didn’t mention a mid-year cut. He’s hoping we’ll have raises next year because it’s an election year. The Chancellor also spoke on the mysteries of the Moody’s credit rating system. The meeting also discussed Excel Maryland, a program that will come up with an economic development plan for the state focused on STEM. The meeting also featured a discussion on work load which revealed how other institutions handle it. Gibson would like to have a similar conversation here at UB.

1. **Executive Session – Meeting closed to only Senators at 1:47 pm. Discussion of Honorary Degrees.**

**Adjourned at 2:13 pm**