**DRAFT UFS Minutes**

**October 7, 2020**

**Attendees**: Michael Hayes, Alan Lyles, Stephen "Mike" Kiel, Magui Cardona, Irvin Brown, Zach, Kristen Eyssell, Amrita Shenoy, Karen Karmiol, Mary Beth Amyot, Kathea Smith, Aaron Wachhaus, David Lingelbach, Candace Caraco, Alan Weisman, Tina DiFranco, Allison Jennings-Roche, Maribeth Amyot, Mark Jacque, Kristin Conlin, Julie Simon, Bill Boyd Carter, Michael Frederick, Sally Reed, Sally Farley, Wabei Chitambala, Ron Weich, DMPY902VKD6N-UB, Kurt Schmoke, Michael Shochet, Angela Vallario, JC Weiss, Sharon Glazer, Greg Walsh, Ivan Sascha Sheehan, Frank van Vliet, Teri, Seyed Mohammadi, Seth Kamen, Mortimer Sellers, Elias Nader, Nicole Marano, Neb Sertsu, Jeffrey Ian Ross, Carol Descak, Marilyn Oblak, Christine Spencer, Paul Moniodis, Sarah Gilchrist, Barbara Aughenbaugh, Bill Boyd, Laura Wilson-Gentry, John Burns, Betsy Yarrison, Roger Hartley, Vicki Schultz, John Chapin, Lorenda Naylor, Al Gourrier, Dan Mills, Alicia Campbell, Andrea Cantora, David Bobart, Zondra, Jeffrey Ian Ross, John Burns, Catherine Andersen, Ron Castanzo, John Chapin, Magui Cardona,.

**Logistical Items**

* Approval of September 2020 UFS Meeting Minutes – Minutes Approved with one correction: Next UFS Meeting Date should be reflected as November 4, 2020
* Approval of and Amendments to Oct 7, 2020 agenda – Approved without objection

**Information Items**

* Enrollment Systems Team Final Report
* UFS Committee Reports

**Action items**

Indigenous Peoples Day Resolution from SGA (UFS Action 21-05)

Motion to endorse SGA Resolution made and seconded

Discussion: should go to Colleges/Schools for consideration first before coming to UFS for vote.

Motion with friendly amendment to refer to College/School Faculty Senates for consideration and vote made and seconded.

SGA Indigenous People’s Day Resolution referred to College/School Faculty Senates for consideration

NOTE: President Schmoke stated that UB calendar has already been changed to reflect Indigenous People’s Day.

Motion and second to refer to College/School Faculty Senates for consideration and vote

Passed: 10 Yes, 1 No - Resolution goes to Colleges/Schools for consideration and vote.

LFS Diversity Proposal (UFS Action 21-06)

Library Faculty Senate Diversity Resolution #1

Motion made and seconded

Discussion: None

Passed Vote YES 13

Anti-Bullying Policy (UFS Action 21-07)

Motion made by Greg Walsh, second by Mike Hayes

Discussion:

Kristen Eyssell – The nature of relationship between two parties is problematic for many in CAS. However, CAS position is flawed policy is better than no policy. CAS passes 2 resolutions – one with a change in language, 1 without.

Candace Caraco – certainly even one in a structurally subordinate position might indeed engage in bullying. The intent in drafting was not to limit the definition of bullying. If there is a suggestion for clarification – that would be welcome.

Jeff Ross – Weren’t there CPA amendments suggested?

Tina Di Franco – There were indeed comments in discussion at CPA Faculty Senate – in particular (1) What occurs if there is a finding of no bullying and (2) need for provision regarding frivolous filings. These comments were taken to Work Life Committee via Mariglynn Edlins, Chair. CPA faculty voted and passed policy.

Candace Caraco – with regard to frivolous filing provision in antibullying policy, the AAG was consulted and UB was told that including such a clause would have a chilling effect on filing of complaints. As to procedure regarding a finding of no wrong-doing – this would be handled via processes already in place.

Jeff Ross – this does not sit well with me because CPA did not endorse the policy as presented here.

Greg Walsh – withdraws Motion to vote on policy as written. No opposition to withdrawal of Motion.

Friendly Amendment offered to include CAS language regarding and a clear note of CPA concerns regarding process after no bullying finding is made and should include provision regarding process for handling of frivolous filings.

Section II. A. paragraph 2 reads:

Bullying includes both 1) sustained action or comments over a period of time, and 2) a situation in which the respondent has more physical or social power while the person or persons targeted have difficulty stopping the behavior.

CAS Amendment to Section II. A. paragraph 2

Bullying includes  either 1) sustained action or comments over a period of time, or 2) a

situation in which the respondent has more physical or social power while the person or

persons targeted have difficulty stopping the behavior.

Motion and second to vote on Antibullying Policy with Friendly Amendment to include change of language from CAS:

Vote: Passed, 1 Abstention

Election of CUSF Representative Alternate (UFS Action 21-08)

Motion and Second to Accept Heather Wyatt Nichol as CUSF alternate

Discussion: None

Passed: Vote: 12 yes

Bucher Award (UFS Action 21-09)

Motion and Second to award Jeffrey Weaver, Ph.D. Chair, Adjunct Faculty Advisory Council, the Bucher Award

Motion and second made

Discussion: none

Passed – Vote: unanimous

**Strategic Discussion Items**

Welcome to Roxie Shabazz (could not attend today’s meeting)

Discussion of enrollment post census

Carol Descak – thank you to all who worked hard over the summer on returning students

Referring to Enrollment Document provided in Sakai files directory

We have reached 99% of University goals on both new and returning students.

Returning student numbers fell below goal in both CPA and MSB.

Total enrollment 4194 – this is a 6% decrease from last year overall. However, this is a slowing down of decline in enrollments. Last year we had an 11% decrease. (Decrease started in 2012 with progressive decrease since then.)

CPA

2nd chance – no new students. Andrea encouraged students to continue in the program. (43 students) Note: Jessup Program

Undergraduate – exceeded goals in both returning and new students

Graduates – short on returning students, overenrolled on new students

Merrick

UG and Grad and returners 91 % of goal

Merrick and CPA had just over 8% decrease in projected increase enrollment

CAS –

Did well with new and returning (109% of goal)

Law

grew from last year 4% increase –103% of goal

Ron W. – worked hard to get students. We thought we would see a decline but students came. We have experienced stability in last 2 years – we are stable and where we should be.

Carol Descak - New money that we can give to new and returning students 2.2 mil came from state to recruit students from Baltimore city

Mike Kiel – Question: If we maintained level of enrollment of this year – the size of UB would be about 4500?

Carol Descak – it would depend on returners – We are currently working on setting goals for new and returning students. University is looking to grow, but we have to do something drastically different to get more new students. We grew in freshman – grads grew – with regard to transfer students we were challenged. The problem now is that we don’t have enough at the top of the funnel. However, Roxie has some good ideas.

Mike Kiel – we look forward to hearing her ideas.

Beth Amyot – The number of new students in fall 2020 is less than the number graduating in fall 2020. We have to at least cover the students who are graduating. Also, the category of students matters financially. Where the numbers fell short was on the graduate level where tuition is higher. It is better, but I want to give that information to put things in perspective

Catherine Anderson – Expressed appreciation to everyone for working on returning student numbers – this was remarkable because of the Covid-19 challenges.

Tim Sellers – We would still like to know what is the current structural deficit.

Beth Amyot – we are working on that report.

2019 USM Workload Policy

UB has to update our workload policy.

Mike Kiel: changes to University workload policy include

1. move away from “courses taught” to “hours generated” and

2. There is more flexibility in reporting productivity (publications, grants, public service)

Catherine Anderson – the goal is to capture all work done by faculty. We will be setting up work group to develop the new policy.

Greg – how much will be at the college level and then sent to admin. Is each College/School responsible for determining its workload.

Catherine Anderson – the work group will determine the workload taking into consideration College/School accreditation requirements. We have gathered policies from other system schools. Best part is capturing other work that faculty does and helps with equitable distribution of service. For example, should assessment be considered a work load piece and how is committee work captured?

Candace Caraco– other System schools have not done this work either. Percentage ranges in categories remain in policy – but getting away from courses taught. There will have to be identification of commonalities among schools = trick will be in the details. There is also a need to go back to digital matters to record faculty activity.

Catherine – In addition, in the past we did not have to report MSB and Law data on faculty workload, however, moving forward we have to report both MSB and Law numbers to USM as well. We want to bring a large group together to work on the policy.

Julie Simon - CUSF has been discussing workload policy for years – looking to give faculty credit for what they are doing. For example, if a faculty member is advising students – look to give credit.

Mike Kiel – what should committee look like? Two faculty reps from each school and the committee should not be outnumbered by administration?

David Lingelbach – I agree with Mike Kiel – committees have been dominated by administrators. This workload policy work is in the faculty wheelhouse.

Lore Naylor: What is overall goal or input of having uniformed standards – Is goal to determine resource allocation? What is overall purpose?

Candace Caraco – Some of this is about communicating to legislature – they want to see revenue generated. We want to be able to say to legislature “look at all the scholarly work, etc.” that is being done. In other universities there are different workloads for biology programs as opposed to classics. Pointed out that there are issues in template for reporting to USM. Back to Julies’ comment – we do not want to over complicate things. We want to make adjustments as needed. Question that needs to be answered if “is it one policy across the institution.” This is an iterative process depending on USM answers to our questions.

JC Weiss – when we look at work load and service – those of you that serve on UFS, what credit do you get – Policy ought to acknowledge dedication and provide incentive for service on committees.

Mike Kiel: What does a committee/taskforce to craft new UB policy look like?

Discussion on composition of the workload committee including number of faculty, dean and administration representatives, who should chair the committee, ensuring diversity on the committee.

Aaron Wachhaus – Motion to include at least 2 faculty members from each College/School and more faculty than staff or administrators

Frank van Vliet– second

Discussion:

Lore Naylor -it is workload, but bigger in terms of students

Greg Walsh: I would like to see 1 faculty from each division – and a Dean representative

Candace Caraco – larger committee is difficult, but it’s a good idea. Dean rep is good idea as well

Jeff Ross – would not go with “at least 2”

Kristen Eyssell – Aaron Wachhaus needs to submit a friendly amendment

Catherine Anderson – did you suggest that someone from faculty chair this.

Aaron W. I would use language – amenable to predominantly, substantially faculty

Mike Kiel: Majority faculty, chaired by faculty, dean representative, minimum 2 people from each College/School.

Motion amended to 2 from each school, 1 dean rep from each college, faculty chair, majority faculty.

Catherine: Candace can be representative from Provost office.

Lore: in terms of making it equitable – equal number of men and women and all equally representative.

Suggested 2 from each school, 1 dean rep from each college, faculty chair, majority faculty, every effort to ensure diversity in gender and race.

David: specify UFS will determine at its sole discretion whether committee is equitable.

Mike: Does library count?

Candace – I have to go back to definition of faculty to answer that question

Mike K – so library will not be included.

Motion and second on Resolution with friendly amendments regarding the UFS Workload Committee composition.

The resolution is as follows:

The composition of the workload committee: majority membership will be faculty, will include 2 faculty representatives from each school, and a faculty member will serve as chair; one (1) dean representative from each college; and every effort will be made to ensure diversity in gender and race.

Vote: passed

Spring and Fall 21 Discussion

Buildings – What are the CDC Standards and how do our buildings comply?

Further planning for spring and looking to the fall

Neb Sertsu– CDC guidelines and how we perform Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA) has service levels 1-5 – these are based on self-assessments

There are two themes – promoting behavior that reduces spread such as social distancing, personal protective equipment, modifying spaces – offices, elevators, plexiglass at security desks. UB has provided masks for the Law school, HR, staff – and students and employees approved to come on campus.

Maintaining health environments – cleaning standards

How to approach cleaning – our housekeeping is cleaning door handles, rest rooms, elevator buttons. We have provided masks, gloves, disinfectant. Over the course of 1 month every building, even if not used, are being cleaned

Ventilation – operating properly, better filters, open doors and windows, recirculating air. Our contractors have looked at AC, law school, and library – and improved ventilation in building. Law school and RLB are new equipment so there is better filtering.

We are not using energy as a reason to not comply. We are losing out on efficiency and trying to get as much outside air inside to help minimize risk of transmission.

Newer buildings are better able to meet the standards, but other buildings cannot be turned on to increase ventilation.

For spring – RLB and Law are new buildings so systems are better. Important to understand:

Current state of facilities – 21 contractual employees were let go 14 housekeepers 7 security. Operating now at moderate cleaning (level 4)? We are operating at level 2 we have housekeepers responsible for less space (dusting, etc.) (level 2). The cleaning levels are self-assessed?

Big themes – revisit staffing levels to meet CDC standards and operational needs

Comprehensive assessment of all buildings – to make sure operating at design standards, moving more fresh air in. We have to make modifications to do that.

People on campus are provided PPE and are tested regularly.

CDC – for reopening closed buildings inspections for mold, lead in pipes – Its my understanding that Academic plans in progress to assess how much classroom/administrative spaces we need. – We will get assessments done right away. Reopening is not about just opening doors.

Kurt Schmoke – Neb gave a quick summary – recommendations from BoR task force (BoR) will be considered. For now, we continue to operate with 2 buildings in spring 2021, planning for greater campus access in summer 21 and fall 21, and increasing time slots for employees to come on campus to collect belongings. The main focus now Main focus is to take action for summer 21 and fall 21. The rest will depend on how we address the recommendations of BoR. In spring we will operate with 2 buildings

The question has been asked whether the BoR will issue recommendations or mandates – BoR has stated they will make recommendations that we have to implement. BoR does not want to see us engage in paralysis by analysis. They will give short-term and long-term guidelines.

Michael Hayes – I want to emphasize that I hope we do not have to wait for summer for increased access. The University has to hire more housekeepng staff. The Law school is willing to chip in to pay for this, I’m sure other colleges are willing as well.

Tim: I think giving access to the law school building would be easy. If we are trying to maintain scholarly activity and support for students there is a need to have as much access as possible. University is willing and able to assist with curb-side pickup if faculty can identify what they want from their offices. Scheduled access is planned but waiting for information from Deans as to dates.

Kurt – more access will not be for fall 2020. But increased access in fall 2020 for faculty to access offices to prepare for spring 2021. We also have to comply with USM guidelines as well.

David Lingelbach- we need to think outside the box. This could be an opportunity to partner with outside organizations to make UB cleanest and safest campus. We made good decisions about pandemic, try for best in class rather than the minimum.

Kristen Conlin – Cost cutting measures – but need to increase staffing. What about ventilation – what are plans for retrofitting systems to bring to compliance with CDC and USM guidelines?

Neb: We have replaced filters Law school, areas in LC that are in use, RLB, and Charles Royal buildings. For buildings that are closed – we are planning to do a comprehensive evaluation of the buildings. Some will be easier (LAP, Student Center) AC, LC will need more work.

Planning on engaging an industrial hygienist, HVAC consultants, however that effort has not started yet. Will start likely in November 2020.

Greg Walsh – Directed to President Schmoke - do you have some knowledge of what the BoR report will say.

Kurt – I got a briefing on Monday – Two sections, finance and facilities, were not completed. I have a sense of what they are talking about, however I was asked not to comment until the Report is released.

Budget Report

What would aid faculty understanding of the budget?

What changes have we made since 2018 in comparison to President Schmoke’s Pathway to Future Success?

David Lingelbach– great report Beth. But what is missing is cash. Where do we stand in terms of cash compared to last year?

Beth Am- our report has a great deal of information. Once you look at it and need additional information – let me know. Where do we stand (remember cash management is different in the academic setting in terms of managing cash? UB has a revenue budget and spending budget. UB is taking action to constrain units from spending money, ergo hiring freeze. Now we have a total of 15M in unrestricted fund balance and 25M in the plant fund. Accessing either of those funds we would have to have Board of Regents approval. We and other USM schools have approval for this year - one time only. We increased our balance by 6 Mil and almost all of that is mandated by USM. Every year we are mandated to increase general reserves and plant fund.

David – that cash is all restricted – There must be times in the year when our unrestricted available cash gets quite low. Cash management suggests to me that we may have liquidity issues.

Beth – this is not a liquidity issue when we talk about managing cash even though spending exceeds revenue budget.

Mike Kiel: What are the major choices that we have to make to manage budget and what are our options

Beth – look at reports posted. One difficulty is that 75% of spending is in people. We have a structural deficit of 10M, question is how do we manage with the level of personnel we have.

Question: What are we doing on administrative side to assess workload and staffing

Beth; we are working on report to show expenditures re: resources, etc. One year ago, all admin areas were asked to analyze. I can say that the realignment will be quite deep institutionally.

Upcoming

* UFS 20-21 meeting dates (all on Zoom)

November 4, 2020

1. BoR Taskforce Report

2. Policy Updates from APC

December 2, 2020

Jan 20, 2020

Meeting Adjourned at 2:02 p.m.