Faculty Assembly Notes April 14, 2022

Good Morning! Kate Brown. We will be joined later by Enterprise Risk Management.

The meeting was called to order at 11:00.

The minutes had a motion to be approved, second. No discussion. Minutes were approved.

Dr. Anderson (49 people on line at this point)

      President Anderson shared that the federal delegation has restarted the funding process known as ‘earmarks’; the new name is designated congressional spending projects.  Based on this new direction, both of our US Senators, Cardin and Van Hollen has contacted the university to make us aware of this opportunity.  Thus, the university has submitted several projects and received appropriate funding from Senator Van Hollen’s office for two projects:  (1) Digitizing our historic records in the library to preserve our rich history and (2) Interdisciplinary Research Center – to provide much needed resources to support the research endeavors.  Senator Van Hollen is visiting campus today, to learn more about the projects and meet with selected faculty and students.  Additional projects have been submitted for opportunities from Senator Cardin’s office as well.

      Dr. Anderson reminded the faculty about the proposal for the Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI) Driving Change project.  This project which is a modified Meyerhoff Scholars program that is focused on creating a UMES STEM program and will be submitted for the May deadline.  Thanks goes to Drs. Jonathan Cumming, Victor Hsia, and Nancy Niemi as the project leaders.   Also, Dr. Anderson expressed appreciation to all of the science faculty who provided input for the proposal; and to President Hrabowski who encouraged UMES to submit the proposal because of our strong efforts in science.

      Dr. Anderson provided a brief update about the USM Strategic Planning process, stating that it will be voted on at the June Board of Regents meeting.  Following that vote, each university is being asked to align themselves along the 5 pillars.  In the meantime, we are reviewing our UMES mission and vision.  A draft mission and vision statements were developed by the extended cabinet.  These draft statements have been shared with the Deans of each School seeking school-wide input from faculty and staff.   In addition, a process for obtaining campus input into our ‘shared values’ will be initiated.  More details will be available at a later date.

      Dr. Anderson shared that the Marketing and Rebranding Study is moving forward.  We are anticipating receiving the new concept before the end of the semester.  TBC will be on campus early June to begin the implementation of the new brand rollout.  She expressed thanks for all who gave input through the campus surveys, meetings, etc.

      Finally, Dr. Anderson reminded everyone to attend the Honors Convocation tomorrow and the farewell reception for Dr. Niemi.  She ended by expressing appreciation to all faculty and staff, who have been making an impact on our students in regards to retention efforts.

Thank you.

The Promotion and Tenure document has been posted in the Canvas site.

There are two options to be looked at, and there are two calendars. The voting for the committee may change. There are few specifics in the actual policy. The Boyer model has been applied. There will be three separate votes.

For the May meeting, we will vote on the policy. We want to get a vote on this, during this academic year. This will only apply to new hires, for those who have an academic appointment in the fall. It is a contract policy. This is the University Policy. Until the department makes the changes, the existing ones will still apply. This ends with the President approval. We have worked hard to incorporate all of the comments that have come in.

This is on the Assembly web page on the UMES site.

Does the P&T document need to go to the board of regents? The provost has checked, it stops with the President.

The two standing committees. She has nothing that needs to come to this body. The FAASC power point has been posted.

Dr. May: The committee has been working on collecting faculty input on for the evaluation of the chair. The policy will be passed by the Faculty assembly. They will check with CITOL to see if we can vote on Canvas. We have been working on things in the near term

Mr. Primus is not here.

A presentation by the Risk Management Services: Deloitte

Antonio Crombie, Jake Braunsdorf.

They were selected by a competitive process

We have been engaged by the University of Maryland Eastern Shore to manage risks 28:11 of 107

I am joined by my colleagues

We need to identify, assess, prioritize and mitigate risks. Will need to present to the chancellor. Wanted to build in Best Practices. Each USM system needs to help prioritize the top risks.

Deloitte was hired to

One: Provide assessment

Helped classify and prioritize risks, for high priority risks

Help build sustainable processes.

ERM process.

It helps to follow a well-defined process.

The lifecycle graphic depicts the phases of the ERM process.

1. Identification of Risks: Identify and categorize risks that impact the achievement of strategic goals and objectives
   1. Conducted interviews with 18 stakeholders across UMES
   2. Developed Risk statements for 74 risks that were identified during the interviews.
2. Prioritization of Risks: Apply risk rating criteria to evaluate overall exposure to the identified risks
   1. Validated risk statements with interviewees
   2. Scored risks by impact and likelihood
   3. Developed 17 consolidated risk statements that mapped to the 74 detailed risk statements
3. Classification of Priority Risks: Determine the most critical risks
   1. Conducted risk classification workshop by mapping the 17 consolidated risk to the strategic initiatives
   2. Tiered risks into 3 tiers based on workshop results
4. Administrators: Identify administrators to be responsible for risk mitigation
   1. Identified administrators for tier 1 risks
   2. Met with Risk administrators to discuss responsibilities
5. Mitigation strategies: Develop response to accept, avoid, reduce, transfer or exploit risk
   1. Met with administrators to develop initial risk response plans
   2. Administrators met with their team to refine Risk Response Plan
   3. Administrators presented Risk Response Plans to the ERM Committee to approve mitigation strategies developed
6. Implementation: Provide Timely and relevant updates to leadership on risk and mitigation efforts.
   1. Administrators oversee and help their risk team implement the mitigation strategy
   2. Administrators report on mitigation strategy implementation back to the ERM committee on a standardized cadence

What are the most critical risks? Identified 74 risks, rated on a scale of 1 to 5, boiled that down to 17 risks and how they will be determined which is the most important?

They went to a workshop, and aligned the 17 risks to the 6 strategic goals. They put the risks into three tiers. We now have a line of sight into what is most critical. They created risk response plans. The administrators defined their risk response plans and activities. They needed to understand the risk response plan, and what they need to address the risk. They risk response group will meet again next week.

Implementation of the mitigation strategies. Are the actions we are taking limiting the risk exposure?

They will get together and determine, monitor and evaluate the risk and what they are going to do about it.

Any questions?

What are the risks? Some of them include budget short fall risk, a large component that drives the university.

Tier 1 – six of them

Budget short fall risk that drives a lot of the university

Student enrollment decline

Transfer student drop out

Faculty and staff attrition

Negative publicity

Academic programs and how they align with career pathways. (Dr. Brown is the lead on this one)

Implementation: Mitigation strategies provide strategic activities to address the top risks impacting UMES’ Ability to meet its goals and objectives

Why implement mitigation strategies?

To reduce the likelihood of a risk occurrence or the risk response plan development and monitoring the status of the risk

Risk administrators gather a team to aid in the development, implementation and reporting of mitigation strategies

*Key UMES stakeholders:* incorporate mitigation into day to day activities

How are mitigation strategies implemented?

Risk administrators and select team meet key stakeholders to discuss key inputs needed to address and mitigate the risk:

Identify current activities are in place and future activities to supplement risk mitigation

Identify type of resources needed to address risk

Review mitigation strategy with the ERM committee for approval

Report status to ERM Committee or an agree upon cadence

They will send out the list of the risks and the people responsible

They interviewed chair of the faculty assembly and the chair of the senate as well. The thinking was that we had representation. As the program matures there is an opportunity to expand the list of faculty and various departments, and students as well.

There will be much more discussion

Kate Brown will be reaching out to about 10 people to get things done.

We have covered about everything that has been complained about to her and Jamilla Johnson, senate chair.

There have been people who will put together the next step. This was an introduction to the process.

Career services will be involved.

We have talked about these things along time, and we are hoping to implement solve the problems.

He is hoping the lists will continue to look at what is happening.

This is an initial process, to identify, review and assign risks.

This is the beginning of this process.

Her project is to make the programs align to the career needs of the students.

How does this ERM process complement a SWAT analysis that may have been done?

The University as part of the planning process should have done a SWAT analysis. There were six goals and underlying processes.

What are the risks for achieving the goals? This is a complementary process.

Dr. Nastvogel: Last CUSF m March meeting. The minutes have been posted to Canvas.

Their were surveys that were senate out. They are redrafting the policy on academic integrity. The chancellor is talking to Course Hero, that is causing academic integrity issue.

The USM bullying policy is going to updating. It is currently focused on staff, will add faculty.

There will be an update to vaccination policy.

We will set up for the nominations on Canvas. We need chair elect, secretary, parliamentarian and the 2 CUSF representatives.

Please make your nominations on Canvas? They will be open for two weeks, then there will be an electronic elections.

Debbie Sauder- Camilla Jackson, a chair at Spellman College will be on Campus from noon on Thursday to the 5:00 on Friday. She is slated to do talk on Thursday afternoon, and Friday morning.

The faculty workload will be released and due in three weeks. Dr. Wiggins can you please explain? This will be the items that USM has asked us to address. How many papers did you publish? How many did you submit? Workload is trying to be addressed.

We will receive this by email. It is slated to be addressed directly to the faculty, whom may not all be on the list serve?

Any other announcements? Motion for adjournment.

A total of 96 people were on line, and 15 people in the library.