**UFS Minutes**

**November 4, 2020 Meeting**

Attendees: Stephen "Mike" Kiel, Al Gourrier, JC Weiss, Tina DiFranco, Constance Harris, Alan Lyles, Michael Shochet, Karen Karmiol, Alan Weisman, Jeffrey Ross, Ron Weich, Ray McCree, Wabei Chitambala, Julie Simon, Jeffrey Hutson, Kristen Eyssell, Candace Caraco, Barbara Aughenbaugh, Phil Korb, Bill Carter, Greg Walsh, Maribeth Amyot, Michael Hayes, Michael Frederick, Paul Moniodis, Andrea Cantora, David Lingelbach, Stef, Catherine Andersen, KTW, Nicole Marano, Antieris Johnson, Jim Campbell, Mark Jacque, Laura Wilson-Gentry, Sally Reed, Christine Spencer, Sharon Glazer, Irvin Brown, Lorenda Naylor, Cindy McGowan, Frank van Vliet, Aaron Wachhaus, Jim Campbell, Seth Kamen, Jeffrey Ian Ross, Kathea Smith, Marilyn Oblak, Vicki Schultz, Ron Castanzo, Neb Sertsu, Bill Schnirel, Carol Descak, Magui Cardona, Sally Farley, Mary Beth Waak, John Chapin, Teri Oyegoke, Zach Luhman, Seyed Mohammadi, Betsy Yarrison, Allison Jennings-Roche, Roger Hartley, Suzanne Tabor, Kathea Smith, Karyn Schulz, Mortimer Sellers, David Bobart, Kevin Wynne, 17025951865

**Logistical Items**

Approval of Agenda – Motion and second to approve Agenda. Passed unanimously

Approval of Minutes (two documents) Motion and second to approve 2 sets of minutes

October 21, 2020 Special Meeting

October 7, 2020 – UFS Meeting

Passed: 12 yes – no abstentions

**Information Items**

**Charity Campaign**

Maryland Charity Campaign – Ray McCree reported on this year’s campaign. It is a workplace charitable giving campaign which provides the University community the opportunity to contribute to this cause. This year’s theme is “One family, One hope.” Contributions accepted through December 31, 2020. All contributions can be made online through the UB portal. If questions contact rmccree@ubalt.edu

**CUSF Report** – Mike Kiel attended CUSF meeting of all faculty senate presidents and a number of topics were discussed. Q&A with Chancellor – 2 observations

1. main topic – how USM schools are dealing with Covid-19 and whether there was a USM grading policy during Covid-19. Answer: no USM policy, it is left up to each individual institution to decide grading policies.

2. Centralization v. Decentralization of certain services. No clear answer provided as to why some services were centralized while others were not. Very generic answer to the question

Note: extension of withdrawal period was put in place for fall 2020 semester. Catherine Anderson noted that students were appreciative of the extension.

Announcement: Please respond to faculty survey. Response rate has been low. Candace Caraco will resend the link to all faculty.

**Annual Leave Carryover Guidance – no discussion**

**Action items**

* Academic Policy Committee

**Online Test Proctoring**

Al Gourrier reported that via RFP process, PRNow has been selected. Academic policy committee drafted the policy and now presented to UFS for approval. New phase with a new product – the policy is somewhat vague but gives some direction to faculty and potentially colleges developing additional policies.

Motion to endorse the policy: Aaron Wachhaus

Second: Frank Van Vliet

Discussion: None

Passed: 12 Yes, no abstentions (21-10)

**Course Modality Definitions**

Al Gourrier reported the need for University to develop language with regard to course modalities to comply with state regulations. Definitions were written and presented to UFS as draft. These definitions are based on definitions as set forth in COMAR. The need to create common language was driver for this policy.

Motion to endorse the policy: Greg Walsh

Second: Julie Simon

Discussion: None

Passed: 13 Yes, no abstentions (21-11)

**Strategic discussion Items**

**SGA Resolution on Fall Grading (Credit/No credit options for grades in fall 2020)**

Questions raised with regard to impact on GPA for students seeking to apply to graduate schools. Catherine Anderson reported that no schools in the USM system have chosen to implement pass/fall grading for spring 2021.

Candace Caraco reported that spring 2020 analysis showed that compared to 2019, grades were slightly higher in spring 2020 2020. Also, less WA were taken. Low number of students took advantage of Pass/No Pass options. For those that did elect this optional grading, notations were placed on transcripts. Alternative grading is not beneficial for those who want to apply to graduate schools. The University wants to protect the intellectual integrity of education and the educational record. Provost’s office met with SGA representatives in summer 2020 and discussed the data that had been collected. It was noted that registrars in USM system schools do not support alternative grading.

Faculty discussion:

Alternative grading across the board is a disservice to the students and is particularly harmful to weaker students. Alternative grading does not encourage high standards. The withdrawal exception will meet the needs for those students who are experiencing difficulties. It would also be helpful to more broadly publicize the Incomplete policy so students are aware.

Candace Caraco noted that Incompletes were initiated by faculty. When incomplete policy was enacted, the Incomplete to F rates decreased. We should encourage flexibility in granting incompletes with caveat that if incomplete is work is not done by a date certain, the incomplete converts to a grade of F. One element to consider is the population of students who are 1st generation students may be unaware that an “incomplete” policy exists. As such, it is important for students to be advised that such a policy exists.

Catherine Anderson suggested that Registrar send reminders to all colleges regarding incomplete policy.

**Graduate Council**

Aaron Wachhaus reported the need for a graduate handbook as we move toward more graduate focus. Graduate Council is actively interested in engaging graduate Program Directors and Chairs to discuss shared resources for graduate students. There is a graduate webpage that addresses admission, however, there is also a need that those admitted to graduate programs understand the policies related to graduate school in general and the specific graduate program.

The Graduate Council is suggesting that because there is no graduate office, these efforts would need to be coordinated by a unit that has a connection with all the colleges. It has been suggested that someone from Provost’s office coordinate. Also suggested was the need to centralize graduate resources and processes.

Catherine Anderson states these are good ideas, however, the Provost’s office does not have the capacity to build – it will be able to maintain, but not build the resources (websites, handbook, etc.). She suggests that the Graduate Council undertaking the building of these resources. Response was that it may be challenging to build resources and modify program policies in all schools. Should be a central repository of resources for graduate students with each program listing its policies and guidelines and a place for graduate students to share their experiences.

Catherine Anderson iterated that the Provost’s office could maintain (make sure links are working, etc.) however, it cannot build.

Jim Campbell commented in chat that this may be an opportunity to work in Sharepoint to create a set of resources that serve as self services area in a secure environment. This could be opportunity to work with OTS new Business Systems Improvement and Support office.

John Chapin stated that he has been working with the webmaster and OTS on a page for student learning: Sakai, netiquette, tech requirements, etc. He would be happy to discuss with Graduate Council if this sounds like a good fit.

**Gen Ed Council**

Betsy Yarrison reported that the Council has revised and simplified forms for certifications. In the future if you fill out one of these forms it will go directly to Gen Ed Council.

Alert: The Gen Ed Council assessment plan expires in spring 2021 – as one of its goals it is working on a new assessment plan and in response to BoR Gen Ed Council is doing a self-assessment and SWOT analysis. Betsy has requested that there be Gen Ed representation on the BoR committees because there needs to be an understanding of Gen Ed to move forward on some of the recommendations.

**The Board of Regent’s Taskforce Report – Continued discussion from previous meeting**

Implementation Committees include:

1. Identity - All Deans

2. Enrollment Management: Roxie Shabazz

3. Lower Division/Upper Division: Roxie Shabazz

4. Academic Portfolio: Catherine Anderson

5. Student Experience: Nicole Marano

6. Marketing and Branding: Theresa Silanskis

7. Financial Responsibility and Alignment Team Lead: Beth Amyot

8. Physical Environment: Team Lead: Neb Sertsu

**How will we ensure transparency as this BoR work proceeds?**

Discussion:

Need clarity on what process will be put in place for faculty assignments.

Catherine Anderson: Staff Senate is doing it differently – Staff senate collects names and then picks the representatives. Deans can include anyone they want. Do you want me to decide? Do you want the college senates to decide?

Nicole Marano – my understanding is 2 faculty, 2 staff on each committee. SGA is also looking to put students on the committees. Because of the quick time frame – need to get more information from the BoR.

Beth Amyot: Implementation leads are expected to present to President Schmoke for approval of team members on each committee. I would like to know who is interested in serving.

Mike Kiel: There are 8 teams, 2 are led by Roxie Shabazz. We have heard from three leads and the information is different from each of you.

Faculty – People across campus are all overworked – no one should take on more than one task – but we need one agreed upon process. Because we have tight deadlines, Deans should be deeply involved, members of the faculty should also be involved. The people that are decision-makers need to be identified. We need clear chains of commands. Also, a concern that pre-tenure faculty may be concerned about contentious issues and may fear participating.

Beth Amyot: I was referring to something issued by the president – the implementation teams must be approved by the President. The President will make the final decision regarding implementation.

Catherine Anderson: we have tight timelines – we also need approval from the President – understand that groups are not equal, if for example on my teams I have 2 staff, 2 students 2 faculty –that may not be a good composition for the tasks at hand. I know the Deans are working on this. We need expertise on these teams – we need right people to serve.

Nicole Marano: Staff Senate is getting volunteers together differently.

Roger Hartley: I support a role for the Faculty Senate, but Deans, Executive Directors and Chairs should be included in the decision-making process. I have asked some faculty to serve on committees. I’m happy to share my recommendations

Motion by Kristen Eyssell: Presidents and Deans forward faculty names to the relevant committee leaders to make final decisions in consultation with the President regarding membership on committees by noon Friday, November 6, 2020.

Second: Frank Van Vliet

Discussion: why is this motion needed if this is already occurring?

Mike Hayes: Not all Deans know that they are supposed to be doing this. I have to leave the meeting, however, I would vote no on this motion

Catherine Anderson: tasks need specific people to serve on these committees. We have to make sure everyone feels represented. I would keep that process going – the ultimate decisions – I want all colleges represented at the table. I suggest we talk with President Schmoke about this

Mike Kiel: So, Catherine, your suggestion is to send all names to leads? Catherine Anderson: yes

Beth Amyot – remember the President has the final say about team memberships. For my team, members must have the proper skills and abilities to get the work done, there will be other people other than the names sent forward.

Kristen Eyssell: Accepts Friendly Amendment: All presidents, UFS, and College Senates to forward volunteer lists to the relevant implementation team leads who, in consultation with the President, select team members names to be submitted by Friday, November 6, 2020, 12:00 p.m.

Second: Julie Simon

Passed: 12 in favor; 1 opposed. (21-12)

Mike – Reporting process

There is confusion about the need for a steering committee which should have a progress monitoring process in place.

Mike Kiel: trying to put in place a process to make sure that the teams are on track and meeting deadlines. Kurt Schmoke has stated that the GSC will serve in that role. GSC will be monitoring to make sure each committee is on track, meeting deadlines and getting work done. Suggestion was made that the President’s chief of staff (Joanne Kess), who reports to President, perform this monitoring function.

Motion: The UFS has taken the position that the GSC, as identified by President Schmoke, is not the appropriate entity to serve as the monitoring body and that an individual, to be selected by the President of the University, should serve in that role and further, that the person selected not be a person serving as an implementation team lead.

Second: David Lingelbach

Motion passes: 9 yes (21-13)

**UFS Future Meeting times**

Mike Kiel – there is a concern about UFS meeting times because President Schmoke is on USM Chancellor calls and is not able to attend. It is important that the President attend future UFS meetings. Mike Kiel will discuss with President Schmoke potential solutions to this issue.

Upcoming Meetings

* UFS 20-21 meeting dates (all on Zoom)
	+ Dec 2
	+ Jan 20
	+ Feb 3
	+ March 3
	+ April 7
	+ May 5