**UFS Minutes**

**Meeting: 4 March 2020**

**Bogomolny Room, Student Center**

Attn Members: Stephanie Gibson(UFS Pres/CAS), David Lingelbach(MSB/UFS VP), Stephen “Mike” Kiel(UFS Sec/Libraries), Darlene Smith(Provost), Julie Simon (CUSF), Tina DiFranco(CPA), Jeffrey Ross(CPA), Irv Brown(Adjunct), Frank VanVliet(MSB), JC Weiss(MSB), Sally Farley(CAS), Mike Frederick(CAS), Michael Hayes(Law)

Attn Guest: Ben Wright(CPA), Amrita Shenoy(CPA), Alan Weisman(CPA), Elias Nader(CPA), Roger Hartley(CPA), Aaron Wachhaus(CPA), Murray Daziel(MSB),Bill Carter(MSB), Kathea Smith(MSB), Marilyn Oblak(MSB), Candace Caraco(Provost Office), Karen Karmiol(Provost Office), Paul Moniodis(Provost Office), Dave Bobart(OTS), Mason Paris(OTS), Chris Spencer(CAS), Betsy Nix(CAS), Sharon Glazer(CAS), Greg Walsh(CAS), Stan Kemp(CAS), Todd Harper(CAS), Ron Costanzo(CAS), John Chapin(RLB), Jeffrey Hutson(Libraires), Michael Shochet(Libraries), Allison Jennings-Roche(Libraries), Constance Harris (CELTT), brandy Jenner(CELTT), Zach Luhman(SSSS), Bill Schnirel(SSSS), Seth Kamen(EMM), Mark Jacque(Records), Barb Aughenbaugh(A&F), Seyed Mohammedi(UBO), Bill Boyd(UBO), Mary Beth Waak(UBO), Wabei Chitambala(UBO), Leslie Joyce(IA), Liz Bowie(Baltimore Sun)

**Consent Agenda**

*Logistical Items*

* Approval of February 2020 minutes (1 document)
* Approval of and amendments to March agenda (1 document)

*Information Items*

* CUSF report (1 document)
* Elections (1 document)
* Turnover data (1 document)
* Enrollment systems process update (1 document)
* Bylaws (1 document)
* Five year fundraising report (1 document)

Action items

* Gen Ed
* Emeritx status (1 document)
* Grade Challenge (1 document)
* Academic grievance other than grade challenge (1 document)
* Name change for UG BS Health Systems Mgmt (1 document)
* Name change for GR MS Health Systems Mgmt (1 document)
* BS Cyber Forensics (2 documents)
* Substantive Modification BS AIT (1 document)
* Modality addition – BA PPIA to have online major (1 document)

***Opening remarks:***

* College Presidents should make sure to hold elections as soon as possible so that we may populate our committees for next year and elect Senate officers at the May meeting.
* Members of the senate are also encouraged to review the turnover data that has been provided.
* Mike Kiel, Michael Hayes, and JC Weiss will be working on some language to clarify a few of our bylaws before the end of the academic year.

***Actions:***  
General Education Council - The GEC was charged with reviewing the SLOs for the ethics requirement to see if they were too restrictive. The conclusion of the committee is that they are not and do not need to be changed at this time. The committee looked at both our policies and the philosophy of our program. Philosophically the purpose of the requirement is to have students critically engage with norms with a grounding in ethics, this reflects a point of view external to a discipline rather than an internal point of view that asks students to be informed of about the norms. This philosophy is reflected in the SLOs. In terms of policy there is no barrier to courses being certified, anyone can submit something and we hope faculty feel free to do so!

* Think carefully about assessment in terms of what kinds of courses you submit.
* The Senate thanks the GEC for doing this
* Betsy Yarrison is now chair of GEC if there are questions or comments

Academic Policy Committee -

Emeritix Policy - The Senate asked that procedures be pulled out into a separate document. There were also questions about benefits, it is now easier to determine these through a link to the engaged faculty policy. **Passed unanimously [Action 20-12]**

Grade and Academic Challenge - Students have sometimes refused to meet with decision makers and involved faculty, so counsel recommended a change to policy. A notable change is that timelines are harmonized and changed to working days.

* Does this go in the handbook? It goes in the policy guide, but the documents are linked. We can make it easy to find.
* Do the working days include summer? Yes and there are provisions for dealing with the potential of faculty being off contract through the use of other responsibly parties. **Passed with one abstention [Action 20-13]**

Programs an Changes -

*Names* - Health systems management seems to convey to prospective students an IT related major, so a title change will be more consistent with the market.

* BS in Health Management,
* MS in Health Administration

Discussion:

* I think I would be confused by this name as a student. The name seems to be the trend in the market, specifically not using “care” a la Healthcare Management.
* I worry that it would be confused with nursing. Also is there a reason that the two names are different? It truly does reflect the market, as an example these names better parallel feeders from community colleges.

**Passed unanimously [Action 20-14]**

*Cyberforensics BS* - There’s been research and interest from community colleges in adapting down from the masters degree. There should not be program overlap and there is an opportunity for intentional sharing between existing programs and faculty. Funding for this comes from governor’s office on work force development.

Discussion:

* Enrollment targets are noted to be unrealistic in some comments in these documents. What is your response? These are initial targets for Fall ‘21 and as this is a unique program in the state, I would hope we can get close to 20 by that time.
* How are we budgeting for this in the fall? This program is not included in fall projections and budgeting

**Passed unanimously [Action 20-15]**

*BS in AIT* - These changes lower the number of credits and make the program more transfer friendly, tracks are also changing names to meet the market. A third track has been added to allow a student to move through the degree more quickly. **Passed unanimously [Action 20-16]**

*Modality in PPIA* - These changes will allow an online bachelor’s program. It will not be advertised as an online degree, as we don't have the ability to do all of general education online.

Discussion:

* Is there a projected enrollment increase? We don’t have those numbers handy but yes, we also think it will improve retention.
* We could do more to market the online programs collectively more effectively.
* Sometimes there are changes that are more defensive than offensive, this is a good defensive one which also provides enhancement in scheduling  
  **Passed unanimously [Action 20-17]**

**Strategic discussion Items**

**Coronavirus contingency plan**

* CELTT has shared a plan for online training to help faculty plan for continuity **[Document 20-L]** Eight workshops on sakai and zoom for faculty newer to online teaching will be offered starting next week.
  + Has something gone to the students to prepare them? Not as of yet, that will be a next step.
  + It will be important to know about student who have accommodations in advance of creating any virtual class sessions.
* UB has an emergency management team (CFO, CIO, most of the central administrators) as well as an operations team which is larger. There is. The operations team is already updating an existing emergency plan that was written some time ago which includes a pandemic section.
* As things evolve there are conversations going on both within UB and the system, for example the email yesterday suspending international travel was coordinated by the system. Just this morning, there was a decision made to have an intercampus interfunctional workgroup to coordinate efforts. We’re lucky the UMB has a lot of expertise in this area and in some ways they are taking the lead, and the chancellor is from there and is a physician. UB’s lead in these efforts is Neb Sertsu.
* There is a simulation exercise in progress now that Neb is attending with several other campus representatives. A multifaceted approach is ongoing to examine what we can and can’t do remotely.

Discussion:

* Thanks for what we’ve seen already, its important to communicate a lot. We need even more transparency! Being clear and open helps dispel fear. Lots of faculty are winging it responding to students so if you can speed that up it would be helpful.
* There are also some simple things wwe could do like purchase phone disinfectants and disinfect buildings and notify the community we have done so
* Should the campus close the plan would be to shift to synchronous online courses?
  + Yes via Zoom and Sakai.
* The time frame for Zoom would make virtual classes problematic.
  + UB already has some licenses for longer meetings with more attendees and will be buying additional licenses for longer time frames to facilitate more class meetings
* One of the most difficult things to do would be converting exams to an online environment.
  + In addition to the workshops CELTT will still do one to one communications and consultations to help with these requests
* Student access to technology also might be a problem. Could we purchase inexpensive laptops to give to those who might not have them?
  + Administration is trying to think broadly about technological implementations in the event campus must close
* There have been some questions already about academic support being available. Academic Success has already discussed how we would increase availability. If students are pushed into an online environment we anticipate being able to respond.
* We we also need to make sure that we offer training for the adjuncts
  + The document and training opportunities shared will go to all faculty including the adjuncts
* Faculty should be sure to stay home if ill and communicate about how you will handle or modify absentee changes to students
* It might be useful if there was a template or list of recommendations for faculty to implement short of fully shutting down.

**Underperforming/low enrollment programs (1 document)**

The Senate President reminded everyone that faculty are in charge of the curriculum, citing as an example approving changes and creation of programs earlier during the meeting. It was also noted that the document presents recommendations not final decisions.  
Discussion:

* What is the explanation for why we would retain a program that is losing money, for example the large CM2 deficit for the BSBA?
  + In order to make decisions, the senior leadership met and we looked at not only finances (CM1 and CM2), but also mission alignment, the extent to which undergraduate programs feed graduate programs and other factors.
* It reads as was just described, incorporating a number of different kinds of information or analysis. How was the document developed? Is it a consensus of those involved?
  + To a large extent it is a consensus document that captured the conversation of the group
  + The Dean of CAS was unsure of whether a consensus is reflected as all parties involved in drafting didn’t see all comments and there was not a dialogue after the initial meeting
  + It is clear that the draft did incorporate some additional comments, however it does not capture every opinion or piece of information comprehensively
* Some of the data points that were mentioned earlier program directors were unaware would be used as metrics to evaluate their programs, feeding UB graduate programs for example, and that seems unfair.
  + The feeder data was shared in a document earlier this academic year. One of the reasons we provided and used this was a recognition that there might be small programs that would have a longer term ROI.

* The process we seem to be using doesn’t give an opportunity to respond in good faith to different kinds of programs. It also seems rushed. I’d really like to see time for faculty to respond, rather than have decisions to be made in haste
* We’re talking about untapped potential. There is more potential from feeding to the MFA from the IA degree and we could work on that.
* Faculty need an opportunity to be able to show the administration some of the less visible impacts of the program
  + For example in IA the work and presentations surrounding students work with local museums. Experiential learning is statistically proven to improve student writing more than traditional learning environments and several students have obtained internships employment from the connections made with our final project. We are one of the few places that can leverage these experiences to close achievement gaps
  + A number of students have felt as though cultural institutions were made open for them when they otherwise wouldn’t have felt welcome to even go inside. This is a benefit that is hard to quantify.
* Faculty understand that we need to increase enrollment and be cost effective, we should be given time to do that.

* The justifications seem to be structured around structures that assume CPA or MSB remain more or less the same. So it bothered me that the way this was presented didn’t seem to frame it as a vision change for schools.
  + Part of the discussion of, for example, the IA degree is about revamping it in a way that would match something different like management in the business school
* It’s concerning that we are making decisions without knowing what configurations will be of different schools and programs. Would all of the identified concerns be true in a new structure? This sounds like programs will stay or go and they will fit is CPA or MSB rather than imagining a role for the arts humanities and sciences in a four year university
* My family recently discussed how our schools are pulling away from history the arts and humanities. I worry that we while feed into people’s ideas of what is worthwhile, we could be dumbing down our community.
* When I talk to people about coming to UB, I always say we have proximity to incredible places like museums and cultural institutions. I am concerned that I don't have that rationale if we remove these sorts of programs. I think we’ll lose some of our appeal!

* Some faculty have decided to retire to make programs more profitable. I’m struck by how this report purports to be objective, but in the narrative section there is bias. It seems for example, that History is treated differently than English and that makes the conclusions are suspect
* I agree there is bias in the language of the report, but also want to note that some of the programs have had zero marketing budget.
* There are several things in the evaluation of the IA program that seem untrue:
  + The document says faculty did not provide a detailed description of the program, but in the last 2.5 years the program director has completed two program prioritization documents, one 5-year program review, and a pathways document, all of which had detailed descriptions of the program.
  + The only Bachelor's programs at MICA that could be referred to are in Interactive Arts and General Fine Arts, neither of which share our program's commitment to arts and business training. UB also serves a completely different population than MICA, so it’s not clear that they compete.
  + Faculty did not propose changing the name to "Arts Management" previously, that was an administrative suggestion.

* Several points:
  + This seems like program prioritization under another name
  + Faculty don’t seem involved in the creation of this document
    - The Deans brought information from the faculty
    - But the output isn’t faculty ideas
  + The dollar impact of all of these actions would be modest I assume, we should make proposals that share the costs throughout the university effectively. We shouldn’t do it if there aren’t more documents outlining the costs.
  + Suddenly it seems as though the Merrick School is to be one of business and technology. I worry that this would affect the accreditation of the school, and the faculty haven't discussed that
    - A bottom up approach would be better
* We have an ethical responsibility not to make organizational changes without robust data. We don’t really have any financial information.
* I don’t think I could vote on these recommendations because there isn’t enough information right now. As ideas none seem crazy, but how could I support the idea of a sort of pan-humanities degree or a science policy degree without knowing what it would look like or the financial implications? I would have to abstain.
* It feels like we’re trying to achieve savings on the backs of programs that haven't had a chance to flourish. Are we trying to achieve savings or are we trying to achieve refining our programs?

* The discussions we are having are heart wrenching and heartfelt and we all love the university and the city. We have to solve a very large financial deficit, which is complex and should impact every part of the organization. We’re small and we cant be all things to all people, and as such we should consider the difference between offering courses and offering programs. There could be other programs at different universities that do this at scale. The majority of the programs evaluated in this review were those with very small enrollments. UB has traditionally excelled in serving niche markets and doing it well. None of these recommendations were made callously, they cause anguish and they are difficult. None of us pretend to know the all answers.

* People should not go away thinking that the Senate is agreeing to these recommendations. This body has not agreed to anything.
* Has the SPBC seen these recommendations?
  + It was not part of the discussion, some members hadn’t seen it at the most recent meeting
* These are recommendations right? We don’t have to do it?
  + I believe the UFS would have to approve these sorts of changes, as we did earlier
  + The President is the final decider, the Senate is an advisory body
  + That’s true, he can do anything, though it would be precedent breaking
* There has been a lot of good conversation about proposed changes in the past, for example changes in the english program based on the last discussion. I’d hope each faculty and department can be in conversation with their leadership team about what to do with each recommendation

* **Non-Disclosure Agreement (3 documents)**
* **Budget discussion**
  + **Data visualization**
  + **Structural budget deficit reduction plan with numbers**
  + **3-college model – whence savings?** 
    - **None of these deal with enrollment I’d like to hear about the strategy. I’m astounded at the silence.**

Important Upcoming Dates

* UFS 2019-20 meeting dates (all in Bogomolny Room)
  + April 1
  + May 6
  + May 20, second May meeting if necessary
* May 21, 2020 – commencement (10:30 & 2:00)