

## University of Baltimore Staff

### MINUTES

Monday, September 12, 2016

11 a.m.-noon | BC 321

#### 1. Welcome and Introductions—

Meeting called to order at 11:06 a.m. by **Chair James Hale (JH)**.

**Chair JH introduced Executive Vice President & Provost Darlene Smith (DS)** to discuss the University reorganization.

#### 2. University Reorganization

**Provost DS** explained that the underlying rationale for the reorganization was to enhance organizational effectiveness and our commitment to student success. Breaking down organizational silos is key. A recommended book on the perils of silos is *The Silo Effect: The Peril of Expertise and the Promise of Breaking Down Barriers* by Gillian Tett.

Three main goals of reorganization:

1. Reduce the silo effect at UB which has had a significant impact on effectiveness.
2. Allow the president to be more “external-facing” to network with alumni and major donors to fundraise.
3. Continue our mission to serve students, from inquiry to graduation to alumni.

Under the reorganization, there will be no change in the divisions as a whole. All the divisions are still there. The primary change is the reporting structures, with the exception of University Relations which is merged into “Enrollment Management and Marketing.”

The president’s direct reports have changed from 8 to 4 which frees up his time. This also corresponds with the new vice provost’s role as executive vice president.

Any questions?

[none]

#### 3. Strategic Planning & Budget Committee

**Provost DS** introduced **Senior Lecturer JC Weiss (UFS Chair JCW)**, **president of the UB Faculty Senate** and **Associate Professor Stephanie Gibson, Vice President of the UB Faculty Senate and Chair of the Governance Steering Council**.

**Provost DS:** First, let me give the background of this idea and how it evolved. “If there were hiccups with the process, they rest with me. It was not the intent.”

In the past, there's been an ad hoc strategic planning committee formed to develop a new plan; it had no oversight for the implementation of the plan or the linking of resources to key strategies in the plan. There were questions about whether it should be volunteer vs. appointed. There's also been debate over the representation of the committee.

Other questions about [concerning the ad hoc strategic planning committee] How was the strategic plan linked to the annual plan? How were both integrated into budget priorities, especially in a strategic way?

The Middle States Review process identified that most universities have standing committees focused on strategic planning and budgeting. Provost DS reached out to other universities, looked at their bylaws, procedures, etc. UB's charter is based on those examples.

Provost DS indicated that developing a more mechanism for on-going planning and assessment would strengthen our compliance on Standard 2, which was a concern. Also, establishing this commitment would further demonstrate our commitment to continuous improvement and fostering collaborative governance.

The intent of the committee is to replace the GSC Budget Committee, because it's difficult to have a dialogue about budgeting without understanding strategic priorities. . Strategic priorities should be developed by the community at large, and then you discuss how, when, tradeoffs, etc.

The goal is for the committee to be integrated.

[open for discussion at this point]

**Chair JH:** Would the meetings be open to the community and constituencies?

**Provost DS:** Yes

**UFS Chair JCW:** Point of clarification in the draft. By Robert's Rules of Order, ex-officio means *by virtue of the office*. All the rights and privileges of the other members (unless otherwise noted) would be granted to ex-officio members. That is not the intent here. In caution, these advisory members were added to the strategic planning and budgeting committee.

**Provost DS:** I think it's important that we don't get caught up in voting vs. non-voting. We took out voting because you cannot develop a meaningful strategic plan based on voting. It's important for the plan to be embraced by all members of the UB community. . Voting should only be used for the formal, ratification process. If ever the committee is deciding based on majority vs. minority vote, the committee has lost site of the process. Only for a formal process would there need to be a vote.

**CHRO Mary Maher (MM):** The faculty senate has strategic planning work groups in the colleges where the college would be looking at a variety of metrics linked to academic programming. How would those work with/coordinate with this group?

**Provost DS:** At convocation, we'll announce the priorities for this year (University's aligned with the president's aligned with USM). This committee would also have a voice in these priorities: strategic enrollment management plan, student retention plan, marketing plan, strategic analysis of academic programs...all these plans would be integrated in the University strategic plan. It would be one comprehensive plan. You can't develop a plan without understanding enrollment forecasts, student success, and how program linked to workforce needs. A lot of work around the University would feed into this committee.

**Constituent:** Who wrote the charter? If the committee is replacing the GSC Budget Committee, then wouldn't this committee become a part of the GSC and should be shared governance?

**Provost DS:** I think we're talking semantics. If it's one of the four GSC committees, than it would require GSC approval to eliminate one and replace with the other.

"As for the development process, that was primarily the Provost's office, but we worked with the faculty senate. Most was taken from other documents. I take responsibility—others should have been involved earlier. Sometimes in the desire to do what you think is right in the short time frame, you make mistakes. That was my mistake."

**Constituent:** So is there time for changes?

**Constituent:** If this is shared governance, in consideration of Middle States, then there are structural things that need to fall under our bylaws. I think this is a great idea and will strengthen the University. Because it's short on time and there were hiccups along the way, the Staff Senate needs time to adjust to it. We'd like to take a look at the other models...

**Provost DS:** This is one thing we would need to do to move forward. We cannot develop a strategic plan without this committee in place. What we could do is separate the charter into two parts: the charter (mission and charge of the committee) and the addendum (committee composition) The addendum would be the membership piece. You could approve the charter, but then membership could change from year to year. This would move along the process of approving the charter and then address the membership question.

Next Monday we send the official draft to Middle States. We need a decision on whether the committee will be established or not. . Most people say it's too large, yet everyone wants more people on it. One of the earlier drafts had 12 faculty—it's down to 8 (that's 33% down from the original). It was originally proposed there would be 2 deans—now that's down to 1. Students are SBA, SGA, plus a grad student.

**SGA President Keith Laury:** SGA represents all students. All three student reps should be from SGA.

**Provost DS:** The intent is that everyone has a seat at the table with different voices and priorities. That can be modified.

**SGA Chief of Staff Will Shorter:** Where did the numbers come from?

**UFS Chair JCW:** Other similar committees at other universities—large and small. These numbers mirror what we were finding in other situations. Given the nature of the committee, all the folks on here are speaking for constituents—not their personal opinions but constituents.

**Constituent:** I support the structure and the idea that data should be used to support decisions. Numerically, however, staff outnumber faculty. We're all here for the same reason—students. I also have silo because of unequal membership.

**Provost DS:** This committee will not be developing decisions in isolation. There will be plenty of town halls, etc. The committee will be facilitators of the plan. We need strong, active voices on the committee. Other committees that have had equal representation—like the budget committee—have been ineffectual.

We asked for a student representative for Middle States, and except for the last three months, we did not get that representation. Students' first priority is their academic.

Also, we want to make sure that we have staff members who are comfortable engaging/voicing their ideas and concerns. As a University, we have a strong academic mission. It's not unheard of that faculty have a larger representation. But nothing should come out of this committee that shouldn't represent the community as a whole.

Some of what we're trying to do is to "shed the scars and issues of the past" and build a culture of trust, civility, and respect. We need to reestablish that dialogue, trust, and respect. Let's not get lost on what is a critical step in moving forward.

**Senator Zach Luman (ZL):** This document kind of kicks itself with respect to defining constituencies. The largest constituencies have the smallest representation. We're hearing, 'we didn't have time to do the process, but trust us.' It's hard to trust something that went around the process. Why not make it smaller? It seems there are a number of options here and we're willfully ignoring several of them.

**Provost DS:** Whether it's smaller or bigger, if you come to the table, you have to come with a University voice. You have to come to the table to firmly and comfortably state your ideas and concerns. How strong initially can the staff voice be?

**Senator ZL:** Can you clarify that statement?

**Provost DS:** No.

You can separate the membership from the charter. Equal voice saw a committee that didn't move the dialogue or discussion forward. You trade off strength of voice.

UBSS are empowered to decide which staff members sit on the committee.

**Senator Isabell May:** Can you clarify your experience with staff not feeling authorized/empowered because of their roles? With recent budget cuts, a lot of staff were let go. Also, many of our staff are adjunct faculty. Some of these boundaries that we're talking about actually overlap. Can you give a context for that?

**Provost DS:** Staff members have sometimes been reluctant to voice their concerns, A staff senator actually stepped down because of that issue. It's a cultural issue. To be able to develop a strong strategic plan, there needs to be discussion with strong voices. We need to decide what the University of Baltimore is going to stand for. Yes, the staff were disproportionately cut. The strategic plan and strategy moving forward is to make sure that doesn't happen again. We just have to make sure this university's growth is sustainable. There should be enough proactive planning and evidence based decision making moving forward.

**UFS Chair JCW:** From a faculty perspective—sometimes we get hung up on our perspective “how do we drive enrollment/increase the size of the university?” There's been ineffective marketing. We deal with students on a daily basis. We want UB to be a destination for students. We need to align this plan. What are the budgets that line up for that? We need to align with these plans. Your roles are vital—they're needed to deliver that—the curriculum. A lot of that gets done on a school by school basis and through committees. The schools don't talk much to each other. We need to be more data-driven to address this.

How do we grow for that? The faculty have felt that they need to be heard more because they're in the day-to-day contact with students. It is frustrating that the left hand and the right hand don't talk to each other. At the end of one year we're going to take a hard look at it

**Constituent:** Was there a budget committee in the Faculty senate?

[No]

**UFS Chair JCW:** This committee is advisory and reports to the president.

**UBSS Chair JH:** The GSC Budget Committee reported to the GSC which reported to the President. Issues and concerns could have been addressed in this manner.

**Constituent:** Why aren't we modifying the current budget committee? There's more buy in for GSC.

**CHRO MM:** The GSC Budget Committee was a failure. There was very little communication between the faculty and staff. No one from that committee that ever felt successful. A Strategic Planning Committee makes a lot more sense. Bringing a diverse group of faculty and staff to the table will better inform the conversation. If staff and faculty bring strong voices then the community will benefit and that will move us forward.

As a community member, there is a lot of work that has to happen between faculty and staff. Saying you will not reduce our numbers leaves a stain on

the sense of community. There's a lot of room for repair and building relationships. I applaud a 1 year review panel.

**Senator ZL:** Who is involved in re-making the membership?

**Provost DS:** The GSC through a discussion with the President.

The committee does blend staff, faculty, students, administration—it's a true dialogue and conversation not limited to reporting to an administrator. Am I wedded to these numbers? No. Knowing the amount of work that has to be done this year, I'm concerned about a smaller working group this year.

We're trying to be a data-driven university and to be more transparent.

You'll have to decide if you can live with the membership. I would love to have a vote for the charter without the membership. If this committee is part of the GSC, then it would probably be that group.

The President was also concerned about the size of the committee—the alternative was for the president to appoint the committee.

**UBSS Chair JH:** I think we need a senator-only meeting to discuss this matter further.

**Motion to Adjourn:** Senator ZL

**Second:** Senator Frederick Jasper