



COUNCIL of UNIVERSITY
SYSTEM FACULTY

Strengthening Higher Education through Shared Governance

**Report by the
Council of University System Faculty (CUSF)
to the Online USM BOR Meeting**

Friday, June 19, 2020

With the Coronavirus, pretty much everything is on hold or should I say that the major focus of activities has been virus related. Both our March and April meetings were online. The first attached Commentary is a review of the completion of the items in the 2019-2020 Action Plan and serves as a year end report of CUSF's activities for the year.

MEETINGS AND ACTIVITIES: The following are the meetings and other activities conducted by CUSF since the last report.

- **Thursday, May 16th Online Council Meeting:** The May meeting was held online on the 16th. As might be expected, the primary topic was the Coronavirus and fall reentry. Utilizing the breakout room in Zoom and UMGC's abilities, the group was able to breakout into discussion groups and discuss one of several scenarios for students returning to fall semester. The technique worked exceeding well and can be used for committee meetings. In attendance was Chancellor Perman. He was able to rotate from meeting room to meeting room and glean an overview of the discussion. The technique work very well.
- **Wednesday, June 17th Online Council Meeting:** In a rare occurrence, there will be an abbreviated June meeting. The primary purpose is to update faculty on the reentry plans for fall semester.
- **Elections:** Elections were conducted at the March and April meetings. Although this was reported in the last report to the BOR, it is reported here again. The Executive Committee for next year is as follows.
 - Chair: Elizabeth Brunn – UMGC
 - Vice Chair: Jay Zimmerman – TU
 - Secretary: Ellen Schaefer-Salins – SU
 - At-large: Julie Simons – UB
 - Aerian Tatum – CSU
- **Academic Integrity Initiative:** The Educational Policy Committee of CUSF has been working diligently on BOR policy recommendations to the BOR regarding BOR Policy III-1.00 and 1.02. Because of the virus, continuing work on this initiative has slowed, but

is once again it is picking up renewed interest. On Tuesday, June 9th, the Academic Integrity workgroup had a meeting. The meeting was moderated by MJ Bishop of the Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation. In attendance were CUSF members and the associate provosts or provosts responsible for the academic integrity initiatives on campus. The meeting is a sign that movement is once again moving forward in this area.

- **Emeritus Faculty BOR Member Resolution**: There is no report at this time.
- **Civility Issue**: There is no report at this time.
- **Survey of Institutional Support for Senate Chairs**: This is my going away present. I am conducting a simple survey on the remuneration received by the Senate Chairs. This survey will be useful for senate chairs to advocate for increased internal support. The preliminary findings are presented in the attached commentary and are essentially the findings of the attached final report. (*See the attached commentary and report for the results.*)
- **Survey of Institutional Support for CUSF Council Members**: Complementing the Senate Chair's survey, a survey was conducted of the institutional support to CUSF Council members. Seven of the eleven institutions provided virtually no support. Providing a vehicle from the car pool was the most common form of support. (*See the attached commentary for the results of this survey.*)

COMMENTARIES: The first commentary is a review of the tasks in the action plan for 2019/2020. It serves as a year end report of CUSF activities for the academic year. The second commentary is a preliminary report of institutional support for senate chairs (Commentary 2004.2). Actually, it is the finding of the report which is also attached. The third commentary is a survey on institutional support for CUSF Council members (Commentary 2004.3). There is no accompanying formal report. The newsletter is attached as a separate attachment. This is my last report and I extend my best wishes to Elizabeth Bunn, the incoming Chair of CUSF.

Respectfully Submitted: June 10, 2020
Robert B. Kauffman, Ph.D.
Chair, Council of University System Faculty

Chair's Commentary 2006.1: The Year in Review – HITS and MISSES

The academic year and my term as Chair are quickly coming to the end. It has been a short year. CUSF has been very productive and it is due to the efforts of many. Our local newspaper in Western Maryland does a series every Saturday on its editorial page regarding the hits and misses for the week in review. It is an interesting and useful approach. At the beginning of the year CUSF passed an action plan for the year. It provides the opportunity at the end of the year to see what has been accomplished. Unfortunately, sometimes you can determine the agenda with an action plan, and sometimes events like the Coronavirus determine the agenda. This year the Coronavirus determined much of the agenda. So here are the **HITS** and **MISSES** for the year using the action plan as the guide.

Goal #1.0: Increase communications and advocacy with its constituents.

Advocacy Day (Task 1.1) – HIT. On February 28th, the three Councils worked together with Patrick Hogan and Andy Clark at System to advocate for System during the Legislative session. The Legislative Affairs Committee did a good job in this joint Council effort. The event was deemed to have been very successful.

Newsletter (Task 1.2/1.3) – HIT. CUSF publishes a fall and spring newsletter. It did so again this year. Ericka Covington and Phil Evers, At-large ExCom members, were responsible for publishing the newsletters this year. Again, a job well done.

Clipping Service (Task 1.4) – HIT&MISS. MediaScan is a service provided by System where they do an electronic “clipping service” of the USM and higher education in the news. As in past years, the clipping service was included as part of the orientation session at the September meeting. We did it again this year, but more can be done with it to disseminate this valuable service to the campuses. For this reason, it is note as both a hit and miss.

Faculty Voice (Task 1.5) – MISS. An Independent Faculty Newspaper edited at College Park by and for all faculty members in the University System of Maryland, Faculty Voice is committed to creating programming that responds to voices in its surrounding community. This year we didn't do anything with the newsletter.

Social Media Platform (Task 1.6) – HIT&MISS. This past year Rajeswari implement SLACK. Through no fault of hers, there has been a slow uptake on its use. Its use needs to be reexamined and developed further. I noted it as both a hit and miss because the Coronavirus forced everyone to use Zoom®, A-Team®, Big Button, and other platforms. These platforms are not the same as SLACK, BaseCamp, and similar platforms. However, it has moved faculty more toward the use of social media. My assessment is that this task is closer to the miss end of the spectrum than the hit end.

Goal #2.0: Strengthen shared governance within the USM institutions.

State of Shared Governance Report (Task 2.1/2.2) – HIT. Originally, the State of Shared Governance Report was a CUSF initiative. It closes the loop and provides the Chancellor with important information to use in his yearly evaluation of the Presidents. This year the survey was tweaked a little, but for the

most part remained unchanged from previous years. The report was completed on schedule prior to the evaluations of the Presidents during the first week of April. In its current configuration, the survey and report have operated fairly consistently for the last five years. Since it is a tool being used by the Chancellor, it may be time to revisit the survey and actually tailor it to the needs of the Chancellor.

Committee Outreach Strategy (Task 2.2) – **MISS**. At the invitation of the Senate Chair or equivalent position, a group of two or three CUSF members would attend the on campus Senate or equivalent meeting. The purpose of attending would be two-fold. First, the group would be emissaries of CUSF explaining what CUSF is and what it has done. The September orientation materials can serve as a starting point. Second, they would focus on issues facing the campus and on how CUSF might address them. The group would report back to the CUSF Council as a committee report. It would be a good task for the at-large positions and/or Council members interested in becoming active. This is a good idea that has been discussed for multiple years, but has not come to fruition because the CUSF faculty have other commitments. In addition, it enhances communications with the campuses.

Interprofessional/Interdisciplinary Actions (Task 2.3) – **MISS**. The objective of this initiative is to expand the concept of educating with interprofessional/interdisciplinary engagement. There was some work done on this initiative, but it too became a victim of the the Coronavirus.

Goal #3.0: Advise and work with USM on major policy initiatives.

Coronavirus (Task 3.1) – **HIT**. This was the year of the virus even though it really impacted System spring semester. Reaction to the virus was a continual reaction. Pretty much most of the work groups were put on hold. I note the faculty, and for that matter, the reaction of everyone to the virus as exemplary. First, faculty did a yeoman's job of switching to going online in the middle of the semester. Second and on a personal note, System took a "performance based approach" to deal with the virus. They didn't simply shutdown and cancel everything, but sought ways to apply the criteria of social distancing, etc. to the educational environment. Third, it was a team action involving everyone. Again, the faculty did their part in cooperating and collaborating to make the transition mid-semester. Although it wasn't a workgroup, I gave the effort a hit for the above well reserved reasons.

Goal #4.0: Advocate for faculty welfare.

Regent's Awards (Task 4.1/4.2) – **HIT**. Easily overlooked is the review and recommendations for the Regent's Award. It is a yearly task that requires significant involvement by CUSF members. Again, this task was accomplished and received a hit.

Changing Scope of the Faculty (Task 4.2) – **HIT&MISS**. Education and the faculty are changing. Normally, this topic is addressed in the 11:00 a.m. time slot during Council meetings. I noted that this was a hit and miss. It is a miss because normally we talked about all the changes that were foreseen to be coming to higher education. Because of the virus, we didn't have the traditional discussion of what could be. Rather, we lived what we normally foresaw as change in the future. The transition to online and remote meetings will facilitate changes in higher education that we have not yet even considered. In terms of geological and plate tectonics, the plates have shifted. We lived and survived the tectonic plate shift. This year, we didn't have a lot of discussions about what the changes could be in the future. For us, we lived those discussions. For this reason, I gave it a hit.

Task 4.3 (AI-403): Academic Integrity Initiative (Task 4.3) – **HIT&MISS.** Since 2017, the Education Policy Committee has championed the academic integrity initiative. The Committee has been working closely with Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation and the campuses. It had ambitious plans for this year and had it not been for the Coronavirus, it would have obtained more of what it planned to accomplish. Although I listed it as a hit and miss, it is really closer to a hit because it is still moving forward, only at a slower rate.

Faculty Evaluation Initiative (Task 4.4) – **MISS.** Since 2018, the Faculty Concerns Committee has addressed faculty evaluations with an emphasis on the over emphasis and reliance on student evaluations. In part, this initiative was a victim of the virus. Also, it did not move forward due to the lack of committee leadership.

Faculty Salary Initiative (Task 4.5) – **HIT.** There was not a lot of movement at the System and State levels on this initiative other than a statewide COLA. This is not a criticism since there is not a lot that can be done. However, several of the presidents have developed campus plans to address this initiative. That is success and it is for this reason that it is considered a hit.

Goal #5.0: Strengthen CUSF’s organizational structure and increase its visibility.

Action Item Plan (2017-2018) (Task 5.1) – **HIT.** It was formally approved at the October meeting for one year or until the November 2018 meeting. Most of the items have been addressed in full or in part. Some tasks and action items (AI) are routine initiatives like the Regent’s Awards or the State of Shared Governance Report, and some are new initiatives like the initiative on academic integrity. The plan provided a valuable “do list” for the year’s activities. In reviewing the action plan, we have accomplished more of what I originally thought and for that reason, I listed it as a hit.

Council Membership (Task 5.5.) – **HIT.** Last year a bylaw change was suggested that would change the apportionment of the Council membership based on the number of full-time faculty to a Senate type model where each institution would receive four representatives (Article II - CUSF Bylaws). At this time, Council choose that no change was necessary and decided to leave the apportionment formula unchanged. Since the issue was settled, at least temporarily, it is listed as a hit.

Task 5.6 (AI-506): Elections (Task 5.6) – **HIT.** The elections were conducted. All positions were filled with highly qualified and energetic faculty. ExCom looks as if it will do a good job in “advising the Chancellor and reporting to the BOR” next year.

In summary, there were nine hits, four misses and four hit and misses. Most of the hits were routine items. For a large part, the misses and the hits and misses were due to the Coronavirus and its impact on spring semester. It was a productive year. But more importantly, we survived it. It was due to the cooperative efforts of everyone. My thanks to everyone who contributed this year and made it happen.

rbk

Commentary 2004.2: Preliminary Findings on Institutional Support for Senate Chairs (Note: See also the attached report)

Regarding shared governance on campuses, the leading edge is the faculty senate chair or their equivalent. Section L of the I-6.00 BOR policy on shared governance indicates that it is the job of the presidents to provide a “*commitment of resources and time.... to carry out their shared governance responsibilities effectively.*” The purpose of this survey was to help determine the institutional support received by the senate chairs in carrying out their shared governance responsibilities.

The survey of senate chairs suggested the following preliminary findings.

- **Reassign time and financial stipends** are important workload considerations for senate chairs. Six of the eleven reporting institutions indicated that the senate chair receives reassign time. Three credits per semester was the most common reassign time provided. Two institutions provided remuneration in addition to reassign time. One institution provided the option of taking the financial stipend or buying out a course. Unfortunately, four institutions provided no direct support to their senate chairs. Neither reassign time nor a financial stipend is provided.
- Providing **administrative assistance** is an important source of institutional support. Five of the reporting institutions indicated that they received some form of administrative assistance. The most common form of assistance was sharing an administrative assistant between the staff, student, and faculty councils. Suggesting resourcefulness, senate chairs reported having a graduate assistant or utilizing their departmental administrative assistant.
- Having a **budget** is an important form of providing institutional support. Six of the senate chairs indicated that they had budgets. One additional senate chair indicated that they had no budget but received financial support out of the president’s office. Along with providing refreshments at meetings, senate chairs indicated that their budgets provided valuable training workshops, retreats, and social activities for faculty.
- There was limited institutional support for **major committee chairs**. Two of the senate chairs indicated support for their major committee chairs and even that was problematic. Some of the institutions indicated that their vice chair or one of their major committee chairs received remuneration.

The results of this survey are comparative. The survey does not determine what is the optimum institutional support for shared governance on the campuses. It provides a summary of what everyone else is doing. Those campuses providing leadership in providing institutional support for their shared governance functions should be commended. The senate chairs have been provided with the resources to do their job. Conversely, there are several campuses that may need to improve their institutional support for shared governance functions. Hopefully, these

findings will help them in allocating sufficient resources to carry out their shared governance functions. This survey is an example of CUSF addressing its mission of “*strengthening higher education through shared governance.*”

Respectfully Submitted, April 16, 2020
Robert B. Kauffman, Ph.D.
Chair, Council of University System Faculty

Commentary 2004.3: Preliminary Findings on Institutional Support for CUSF Council Members

Complementing the survey of senate chairs regarding institutional support, a similar survey was asked of the CUSF Council members. Consistent with the BOR I-6.00 policy on shared governance, the purpose of the survey was to determine institutional support for CUSF Council members.

The survey was conducted as part of the April 16, 2020 CUSF Council meeting. The following questions were asked. For those schools not in attendance, an email with the questions was sent to the Council members. In addition, a follow-up email was sent to those in the meeting who did not respond during the meeting. Eleven of the twelve institutions responded.

Item #2: Institutional Support to Council Members: A quick survey on institutional support to you as a Council member. → email rkauffman@frostburg.edu the following

- a) your name / institution
- b) Do you receive reassign time? If so how much?
- c) Do you receive a stipend? If so how much?
- d) Do you receive in-kind support (e.g. car pool car, etc.)? If so what?
- e) Other: Specify:

The results of the survey were not unexpected and relatively easy to compile. The results are presented below.

- **Reassign Time:** None of the Council members responding indicated that their institutions provided them with reassign time to be a CUSF Council member.
- **Financial Stipend:** One institutional representative from Coppin indicated that there was possibly a stipend. The representative commented that “*I just found out a stipend was available but haven’t determined how or if it will get paid.*” In addition, two College Park representatives noted support for serving on CUSF Council.

- **In-kind Support:** The most notable in-kind service provided was transportation related. Three institutions noted transportation related support. Frostburg and Salisbury provide a vehicle from the car pool. Salisbury provides a mileage allowance as an alternative. The representative from UMCES is also the senate chair and has a travel allowance. An often overlooked in-kind service is receiving time to attend meetings. The representative from Salisbury indicated receiving time to attend.
- **Other Support:** Most of the comments regarding the “Other” category were comments about not receiving support which is discussed in the next item.
- **No Support:** Seven of the eleven responding institutions indicated that their Council members received no support. A typical comment indicated that *“I get nothing- I get myself to these campuses on my own dime. I’ve enjoyed looking around campuses, but gas support would be appreciated.”* A second comment indicated that *“As requested, I do NOT receive any release or reassign time nor do I receive a stipend nor do I receive unkind support.”*

Findings and Conclusions. In economics, there is an adage that if you want more of something subsidize it and if you want less of something tax it. Seven of the eleven representatives indicated that their institutions provide virtually no support. It should be noted that most of the institutions do permit attending meeting during the school day. Two of the three schools offering cars from the car pool are institutions located outside of the two beltways. On a personal note, being able to obtain a car from the FSU car pool is a much appreciated benefit.

For the most part, CUSF Council members essentially volunteer their time and cover their costs out-of-pocket. They should be commended for their service and dedication. The Council serves an important function that is often under appreciated on the individual campuses. Returning to the adage, participation in CUSF for most of the CUSF Council members is taxing. The dearth of support has the effect of reducing participation and more importantly it reduces active involvement. The presidents should examine additional ways of supporting CUSF participation by Council members since in accordance with BOR policy, it will strengthen both shared governance and higher education.

Respectfully Submitted, April 18, 2020
Robert B. Kauffman, Ph.D.
Chair, Council of University System Faculty

Commentary 2005.2: Chair's Report – A Look Backwards

The following is from my Chair's Report for the spring 2020 Newsletter. Since I am retiring, I thought that it might be appropriate to include it here. The following is that report.

Sometimes you are able to determine the agenda and other times your agenda is determined by events. This year CUSF's agenda has been determined by the Coronavirus and a reaction to events. Many of our initiatives have been placed on hold or have been slowed.

Personally, I don't like looking rearward regarding what we accomplished because then we aren't looking forward. I am interested in going forward. Since I am retiring, I will indulge myself with a rearward review of our accomplishments. On some of these initiatives, I took a lead role and on others, I helped to facilitate.

Perhaps my biggest contribution with CUSF has been the State of Shared Governance Report. The report surveys the senate chairs and evaluates the presidents on implementing the BOR I-6.0 policy on shared governance. The report is used by the Chancellor in the yearly evaluation of the presidents. The other two Councils have developed similar reports and the process is unique in the country, although it shouldn't be.

The joint omnibusperson resolution is illustrative of the collaborative spirit of the Councils. The proposal originated with CUSF. Because of morale issues, my counterpart with the Staff Council saw the need for the initiative and championed it. Her term as Chair ended and she handed the baton off to me to complete the initiative. With the support of Chairman Brady, the initiative moved forward and System wrote the guidelines to implement the initiative on the campuses.

The role of CUSF is to advise the Chancellor and report to the BOR. In order to remain competitive in the marketplace, the BOR has a policy which seeks to maintain faculty salaries at the 85th percentile. The percentile was dropping precipitously. Getting the State to address this issue with COLAs and merit increases can be problematic. However, many of the presidents developed salary equity plans to increase faculty salaries in accordance with the BOR policy. CUSF addressed this issue and the presidents responded.

Recently, CUSF has had two significant academic initiatives. First, the Faculty Concerns Committee reported upon and made recommendations to the provosts and campuses on the over-reliance of student evaluations in faculty course evaluations.

The second academic initiative focused on academic integrity. Again, this has been a collaboration between the Councils, System, and the Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation. Spearheaded by Elizabeth Brunn, the incoming Chair, I played my part in facilitating an initiative aimed at changing the academic integrity culture on the campuses. With the support of the BOR, the Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation in collaboration with CUSF conducted a convene for the campuses. Those in attendance returned to their campuses to implement

academic integrity and follow-up has occurred with them. Currently, CUSF is reviewing the BOR policy on academic integrity with the intent to update the policy.

Along the way, we developed a mission statement, vision statement, action plan, logo and revised the Constitution and Bylaws. The abbreviated version of our mission statement is to “*Strengthen higher education through shared governance.*” It has been my pleasure to have strengthen higher education in Maryland through the shared governance efforts of CUSF.

Respectfully Submitted, May 1, 2020
Robert B. Kauffman, Ph.D.
Chair, Council of University System Faculty



COUNCIL of UNIVERSITY
SYSTEM FACULTY

SPRING 2020 NEWSLETTER

The Chair's Report



Sometimes you are able to determine the agenda and other times your agenda is determined by events. This year, CUSF's agenda has been determined by the coronavirus and a reaction to events. Many of our initiatives have been placed on hold or have been slowed.

Personally, I don't like looking rearward regarding what we accomplished, because then we aren't looking forward. I am interested in going forward. Since I am retiring, I will indulge myself with a rearward review of our accomplishments. On some of these initiatives, I took a lead role and on others, I helped facilitate.

Perhaps my biggest contribution with CUSF has been the State of Shared Governance Report. The report surveys the senate chairs and evaluates the presidents on implementing the BOR I-6.00 Policy on Shared Governance. The report is used by the Chancellor in the yearly evaluation of the presidents. The other two Councils have developed similar reports, and the process is unique in the country, although it shouldn't be.

The ombudsperson resolution (advocating for ombudspersons or ombuds services at each institution) is illustrative of the collaborative spirit of the Councils. The proposal originated with CUSF. Because of morale issues, my counterpart with the Staff Council saw the need for the initiative and championed it. Her term as Chair ended, and she handed the baton off to me to complete the initiative. With the support of BOR Chairman Jim Brady, the initiative moved forward and USM wrote the guidelines to encourage the implementation of the initiative on the campuses.

The role of CUSF is to advise the Chancellor and report to the BOR. In order to remain competitive in the marketplace, the BOR has a policy which seeks to maintain faculty salaries at the 85th percentile. The percentile had been dropping precipitously. Getting the State to address this issue with COLAs and merit increases can be problematic. However, many of the presidents developed salary equity plans to increase faculty salaries in accordance with the BOR policy. CUSF addressed this issue and the presidents responded.

Recently, CUSF has had two significant academic initiatives. First, the Faculty Concerns Committee reported on and made recommendations to the provosts and institutions on the over-reliance of student evaluations in faculty course evaluations.

The second academic initiative focused on academic integrity. Again, this has been a collaboration between the Councils, System, and the Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation. Spearheaded by Elizabeth Brunn, the incoming Chair, I played my part in facilitating an initiative aimed at changing the academic integrity culture on the campuses. With the support of the BOR, the Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation, in collaboration with CUSF, sponsored a convening for the institutions. Those in attendance returned to their campuses to further address academic integrity, and follow-up has occurred with them. Currently, CUSF is reviewing BOR policy dealing with academic integrity with the intent to update the policy.

Along the way, we developed a mission statement, vision statement, action plan, logo and revised the Constitution and Bylaws. The abbreviated version of our mission statement is to "*Strengthen higher education through shared governance.*" It has been my pleasure to have strengthen higher education in Maryland through the shared governance efforts of CUSF.

Robert B. Kauffman, Ph.D.
Chair, Council of University System Faculty



3300 METZEROTT ROAD // ADELPHI, MD 20783
WWW.USMD.EDU // 301.445.1901

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

To the Council of University System Faculty:

As we wrap up the spring semester, I imagine none of us is doing it in the way we envisioned four months ago. In March, when we made the decision to transition to distance instruction for the remainder of the semester, our universities, students, and faculty had to pivot on a dime. Since then, we've relied on you to provide our students the high-quality education they deserve—even though many of you are providing it in a way you've never done before.

Your ability to adapt—to be creative and innovative and flexible—quite frankly saved our semester. The students to whom you gave your time, attention, and compassion might say you saved much more. As we rightly celebrate the many heroes serving throughout this pandemic, I want you to know that I consider your work heroic.

I won't pretend our circumstances are ideal. I won't pretend there aren't very real frustrations in teaching a course one way when you designed it to be taught in another. Perhaps the most frustrating thing about this time is that we don't know right now when it will end. As of this writing, I've just convened a USM Return to Campus Advisory Group to outline the conditions we must meet if we're to resume in-person instruction this fall. I thank incoming CUSF Chair Elizabeth Brunn for agreeing to serve on this group.

While I know the pain of this pandemic isn't over, I am optimistic. I'm optimistic that we'll weather this crisis together, with new strategies and techniques we can employ long after the crisis has passed. I'm optimistic we'll be more flexible in the future, more nimble in responding to change. I'm optimistic we'll remind our leaders how critical our work really is, as we contribute our alumni, our research, and our scholarship to finding the solutions we seek. I'm optimistic that we'll prove more powerfully than ever before that the University System of Maryland is a public good, and that our mission to educate, to discover, and to serve is just as resilient as we are ourselves.

Thank you for being the leaders we need right now.

Sincerely,

Jay A. Perman
Chancellor





COUNCIL of UNIVERSITY
SYSTEM FACULTY

SPRING 2020 NEWSLETTER

USM Advocacy Day 2020



The Council of University System Faculty (CUSF), the Council of University System Staff (CUSS), and the USM Student Council (USMSC) joined together to host our annual USM Advocacy Day in Annapolis on Wednesday, February 19, 2020. Across the three Councils and the University System of Maryland Office (USMO), 45 people attended this event including: 6 faculty members, 6 students, 28 staff, and 5 USMO staff. Details about the day are as follows.

Patrick Hogan and Chancellor Perman

The Councils were greeted by newly appointed Chancellor Perman, who inspired the groups to advocate for the USM, so we can continue to support the work we do on behalf of our students and the state of Maryland. The Vice Chancellor for Government Relations, Patrick Hogan, and Assistant Vice Chancellor for Government Relations, Andy Clark, also joined the group to share logistics for the day and provide suggestions of areas to highlight during legislative visits. After kicking off the day, participants split into groups to attend meetings with various senators and delegates. Collectively, these Council groups met with 16 senators (9 Democrats and 7 Republicans) and 16 delegates (11 Democrats and 5 Republicans). The focus of these visits was to advocate on behalf of the Governor's budget for the USM and to share all the great work that is taking place at all our institutions. Council groups shared data from the [USM 2019 Annual Report](#) with anyone they were able to visit with during the day. Senator Rosapepe and Delegate Pena-Melnyk recognized the USM Shared Governance Councils for their participation in the USM Advocacy Day during the Senate and House assemblies. Members of CUSF, CUSS, and USMSC were asked to stand to be recognized as welcoming remarks were made during the floor recognition.

Advocacy Day Continued~

Check out #USMAdvocacyDay2020 for posts on social media about the event. The day was very productive and went exceptionally well! Many thanks to Vanessa Collins, CUSS Rep from Salisbury University, and Lori Stepp, CUSS Rep from UMCES, for co-chairing the Legislative Affairs & Policy Committee and coordinating all of the logistics to make Advocacy Day 2020 such a success! Special thanks to Laila Shishineh from CUSS for this Advocacy Day summary!



CUSF Rep, Dr. Ericka Covington of Coppin State University; CUSS Rep LaToya Lewis of University of Maryland, Baltimore; and Lori Stepp, CUSS Rep from UMCES



From right to left: Chancellor Perman; CUSS Chair, Laila Shishineh; Robert Kauffman, CUSF Chair; and Benjamin Forrest, USM Student Council President

SHARED GOVERNANCE

As mentioned in the Fall Newsletter, the shared governance survey was conducted by each institution's senate chair, the results of which inform the chancellor. In the past, Chancellor Caret has taken the survey results seriously and used them as talking points with the individual university presidents. The results were collected and summarized then submitted to Chancellor Perman. Please view attached for the report:

<https://documentcloud.adobe.com/link/track?uri=urn%3Aaaid%3Aascds%3AUS%3Ad97f6134-65b4-4502-b753-023453f8f54a>



COUNCIL of UNIVERSITY
SYSTEM FACULTY

SPRING 2020 NEWSLETTER

ELECTION RESULTS

Welcome our new CUSF Chair, Dr. Elizabeth Brunn!!



The election results for academic year 2020-2021 year are as follows:

Chair:

*Elizabeth Brunn
University of Maryland
Global Campus*

Vice Chair:

*Jay Zimmerman
Towson University*

Secretary:

*Ellen Shaefer-Salins
Salisbury University*

At-Large Members:

*Julie Simon
University of Baltimore*

and

*Aerian Tatum
Coppin State University*

Elizabeth Brunn is a member of the collegiate faculty and is the Program Director of Management Foundations and Non-Profit and Association Management in the School of Business at the University of Maryland Global Campus. In this role, Elizabeth collaborates with more than 168 adjunct faculty, collegiate faculty, the dean, and vice deans to create and teach the curriculum for both the B.S. and M.S. Management programs in the Business School at UMGC.

In addition to her work at UMGC, Elizabeth has been a CUSF representative for four years. As Education Policy Committee Chair, she devoted much of that time to developing proposals to revise the University System of Maryland's academic integrity policy. Academic integrity is a topic that is extremely salient and compelling to faculty and to Elizabeth personally. She served as CUSF Executive Committee Secretary in 2018-2019 and Vice Chair in 2019-2020.

After spending decades teaching, practicing law, and playing a crucial role in running an international food ingredient business, Elizabeth brings a lifetime of hands-on business experience to her students and a practiced eye to guide their success in the future.

Elizabeth holds a B.A. in Government and Politics from the University of Maryland, College Park, a MS in Adult Education from Johns Hopkins University, and J.D. from George Mason University's Antonio Scalia School of Law. She is licensed to practice law in Maryland, Virginia, and the Federal Bankruptcy and Circuit courts.

Elizabeth can be reached at elizabeth.brunn@umgc.edu.



COUNCIL of UNIVERSITY
SYSTEM FACULTY

Strengthening Higher Education through Shared Governance

Council of University System Faculty (CUSF)
Report on the Survey
of Institutional Support
for the Senate Chairs

May, 4, 2020

Regarding shared governance on campuses, the leading edge is the faculty senate chair or their equivalent. Section L of the BOR Policy on Shared Governance in University System of Maryland (I-6.00) indicates that it is the job of the presidents to provide a “*commitment of resources and time.... to carry out their shared governance responsibilities effectively.*” The purpose of this survey is to help determine the institutional support received by the senate chairs in carrying out their shared governance responsibilities.

I - 6.00 POLICY ON SHARED GOVERNANCE IN THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND

- L. *Shared governance requires a commitment of resources and time from the USM institutions. Each institution shall provide a proper level of resources, as determined by the President, to faculty, staff, and students to allow them to carry out their shared governance responsibilities effectively.*

Procedures

The survey instrument was created by the CUSF Chair, Robert B. Kauffman, Ph.D. It was reviewed by CUSF ExCom at their April 2020 meeting. The instrument was sent to the Senate Chairs on April 8th and a reminder was sent to those who didn't respond on April 14th. Eleven of the twelve senate chairs responded. The following are the results of the survey. When reviewing the report, it may be worthwhile to review some of the footnotes in the tables. Although the tabulation was kept simple, there was often a diversity of responses. For example, administrative assistance provided by the institutions could vary greatly including the use the departmental assistant, using a graduate assistant, or sharing a designated assistant with the other councils.

Analysis

The first three sections focused on reassign time and financial stipends for senate chairs. Additional sections focused on administrative assistance, budgets, and remuneration for major committee chairs.

Reassign Time (Figure 1). The first question asked the senate chairs if they received reassign time. Six of the eleven senate chairs indicated that they received reassign time. Five indicated that they did not. Of the six indicating receiving reassign time, two senate chairs indicated that they received a two course or six

credit reassign time per semester. Three credits were typical. Five senate chairs indicated that they received no reassign time. At UMCP, the senate chair has the choice of receiving a financial stipend or buying out a course. Normally, the senate chair receives a \$30,000 stipend over a three year period or \$10,000 per year. If the stipend is used to buyout a course, the cost of the course buyout varies with the different units – but is normally in the range of \$8,000 to \$10,000 per course. Since the current senate chair chose to receive the financial stipend, UMCP was listed as receiving a stipend. However, it could change with subsequent senate chairs.

Figure 1: Does the Senate Chair Receive Reassign Time ?	
Number of Credits Reassign Time Per Semester	Schools
6	FSU
3	CSU, UB, SU ³ , TU, UMBC,
0	BSU, UMB, UMCES, UMCP ¹ , UMES
¹ At UMCP, funds are provided that can be used as a course buyout. Since the current senate chair took the financial stipend rather than the course buyout, UMCP was placed in the zero reassigned time category. Note that it could change with subsequent chairs. ³ Salisbury received reassign time for one course, which is for four credits.	

Financial Stipend (Figure 2). The second question asked if the senate chair received a financial stipend. Three of the eleven senate chairs indicated that they received a financial stipend. Again, the UMCP senate chair received a financial stipend, which can be used to buyout a course. Unfortunately, the questionnaire did not ask for the amount of the stipend. If the stipend amount is mentioned, it was either volunteered or determined through a follow-up email. Also, the question asked whether the financial stipend was income or whether it was to be used for expenses. The three senate chairs who indicated that they received financial remuneration indicated that it was income. The Frostburg senate chair indicated that he received a stipend equivalent to that of a department chair.

Figure 2: Does the Senate Chair Receive Financial Stipend ?	
Provides Financial Stipend	Schools
Yes	FSU, UMBC, UMCP ¹ ,
No	BSU, CSU, TU, UB, SU, UMB, UMCES, UMES
¹ At UMCP, funds are provided that can be used as a course buyout. Since the current senate chair took the financial stipend rather than the course buyout, UMCP was placed in the receiving a financial stipend category. Note that it could change with subsequent senate chairs.	

Reassign Time and Financial Stipend (Figure 3). Senate chairs can receive both reassign time and a financial stipend. Figure 3 is a 2x2 table that addresses this question. Two institutions provided both reassign time and a financial stipend. Four institutions provided reassign time but no financial stipend. Four institutions provided neither reassign time nor a financial stipend. As noted, the UMCP senate chair can be either depending on the choice of the senate chair. The current senate chair receives a financial stipend without reassign time. An additional question asked if the senate chair received any other compensation. Other than free parking [Note: *Parking on this campus ranges between \$95-\$115 per year.*] or a small summer stipend, the two main forms of compensation indicated were reassign time or a financial stipend.

Figure 3: Provides Both Reassign Time and Financial Stipend ?		
	Financial Stipend	
Reassigned Time	Yes	No
Yes	FSU, UMBC,	CSU, TU, UB, SU
No	UMCP ¹	BSU, UMB, UMCES, UMES

¹ At UMCP, funds are provided that can be used as a course buyout. Since the current senate chair took the financial stipend rather than the course buyout, UMCP was placed in receiving a financial stipend (Yes) ,and not receiving reassigned time (No) category. Note that it could change with subsequent senate chairs.

Administrative Assistance (Figure 4). Administrative assistance is an important source of institutional support. Seven institutions indicated some form of administrative support, while four institutions indicated that they received no administrative assistant assistance. Of those receiving administrative assistance, a wide range of assistance was provided. For example, UMCES’s senate chair indicated that they received administrative assistance for scheduling and IT support. Bowie’s senate chair shared that they utilize a graduate assistant. Coppin’s senate chair offered that they had an administrative assistant, but unfortunately, the position is vacant. Three institutions indicated that there was an administrative assistant shared among several shared governance councils. College Park has a director and two counselors who support 10 standing committees, multiple councils and over 200 members.

There was considerable carryover in the response to this question and Question #18 on the State of Shared Governance Survey. This is understandable since both surveys were completed by the senate chairs. Also, this question drew more comments than the previous questions. Several of the comment are provided below.

TU: We share an administrative assistant with other shared governance programs. He also has duties to commencement and undergraduate research, among other things. We went for six months without any dedicated administrative assistance at all, last May-November, and it was chaotic and overwhelming. Our current admin doesn’t do much to support us, actually. It’s unclear who his “real” boss is, or what he’s doing

UMBC: There is administrative support but it is shared among various committees and sometimes not timely and sufficient. This is an area UMBC could do better by either hiring additional help or changing the individuals providing help.

FSU: My predecessor had use of an administrative assistant. He was able to add time to the part-time administrative assistant for the graduate program he coordinated. I was told to use my departmental assistant, who is shared unequally between my department and another (my department has the smaller share of this person's time to begin with).

UMCP: The University Senate at UMCP is a body of over 200 members, with 10 standing committees and multiple councils that are supported by the Senate Office that includes 3 staff members. To manage the workload associated with this large an enterprise, UMCP Senate Office current has a Director and two Coordinators.

BSU: The Faculty Senate has a need for a designated office space on campus.

Figure 4: As Senate Chair, Do You Receive the Assistance of an Administrative Assistant?	
Receive Administrative Assistance	Schools
Yes	BSU ¹ , CSU ³ , TU ² , UMB ² , UMBC ² , UMCES ⁵ , UMCP ⁴
No	FSU, SU, UB, UMES
¹ BSU indicated that they have a GA assistant. ² Shared administrative assistant with other shared governance councils. ³ CSU reported yes but that the position was vacant ⁴ UMCP has a director and two coordinators [See call out in text] ⁵ UMCES receives scheduling assistance and has IT support.	

Senate Budget (Figure 5). Having a budget is an indication of institutional support and the ability to accomplish tasks. Six institutions indicated that they had an institutional budget. UMCP has a \$15,954 budget. UMB had a \$9,000 budget. Three of the institutions had a budget in the \$2,000 to \$2,500 range. Also, it should be noted that the senate chair of UB indicated that she did not have a budget but received lunches for the Senate out of the President's budget. The UMCES senate chair noted a similar situation. They have no formal budget but receive travel support and they receive support for the annual Faculty Convocation which is organized by the Faculty Senate.

Figure 5: What Is Your Institutional Budget for the Senate?	
Institutional Budget	Schools
Yes	UMCP – \$15,954 UMB – \$9,000 SU – \$5,300 CSU – \$2,500 FSU – \$2,500 BSU – \$2,000
No	TU, UB ¹ , UMBC, UMCES, UMES
¹ UB has no budget but the president's office provides lunch at the monthly meetings.	

The next question asked the senate chairs what they did with their budgets. There is the obvious budget item of providing refreshment at meetings. However, embedded in the comments are some good ideas

worthy of consideration like training workshops, retreats, and social activities. Several of the senate chairs' comments are provided below. Complementing the budget question, the survey question following this question asked the senate chairs to indicate their top four budget items. These responses were merged into this section. Any numbered listing indicates their responses to the top four budget items.

BSU: 1) Refreshment during the Faculty Senate and Faculty Association meetings; 2) Workshops – leadership training for future leaders of the Faculty Senate

CSU: [Budget] \$2,500.00 – however, in 2017, we received \$5,000.00 Now we can only have two small events for the faculty. [Budget Priority Items;]; #1 priority) Special Senate Meetings with guest twice a year; #2 priority) Faculty Senate All-Day Retreat; #3 priority) Certificates & Recognitions; #4 priority) Faculty Social Networking Activity.

FSU: Food for meetings roughly \$1,200; Qualitative analysis software for faculty morale survey – \$50; and Faculty Chair's Award \$100

SU: \$1,200 operating; \$2,500 summer stipends; \$1,600 Faculty Fridays (2 x semester social gathering by the Faculty Senate)

UMB: 1) Community engagement (I love UMB Day); 2) Faculty recognition items (e.g. certification, plaques, etc.); and monthly meetings (catering)

UMCP: 1) Meeting Space Rental; 2) In-State/Out-of-State Travel; 3) Office Supplies & Equipment; 4) Catering [Note: *See also the previous comment under administrative assistance.*]

Major Committee Remuneration (Figure 6). The last question focused on remuneration to the major committee chairs of the senate. Nine of the eleven senate chairs indicated that their major committee chairs did not receive remuneration. As indicated in the footnotes, the responses illustrated an inconsistency. UMBC responded to the question with a yes, but indicated that two of their major committee chairs received compensation. In contrast, the senate chair at UB responded with a no but indicated that their vice president received a one course reassign time per year. The senate chair at Frostburg was listed as maybe. Unfortunately, their committee chairs must run the administrative gauntlet by receiving approval for reassign time by their department chairs and deans.

Figure 7: Do the Chairs of Your Major Committees Receive Remuneration (e.g. reassign, time, remuneration, etc.)?	
Major Committee Chair Remuneration	Schools
Yes	UMBC ¹
Maybe	FSU ³
No	BSU, CSU, TU, UB ² , SU, UMB, UMCES, UMCP, UMES
¹ UMBC: Academic Planning and Budget Committee Chair is compensated; Vice President receives a one course per year reassign time. ² UB: Vice President receives one course reassign time per year. ³ FSU: There is support for reassign time from Provost, but Chairs must negotiate reassign time with their department chairs and dean.	

Findings and Conclusions

The shared governance policy indicates that the presidents need to provide institutional support for shared governance. The amount of that support is left up to the institutions to decide. The purpose of this survey is to help the institutions and senate chairs determine the appropriate level of institutional support for their shared governance functions.

- **Reassign time and financial stipends** are important workload considerations for senate chairs. Six of the eleven reporting institutions indicated that the senate chair receives reassign time. Three credits per semester was the most common reassign time provided. Two institutions provided remuneration in addition to reassign time. One institution provided the option of taking the financial stipend or buying out a course. Unfortunately, four institutions provided no direct support to their senate chairs. Neither reassign time nor a financial stipend is provided.
- Providing **administrative assistance** is an important source of institutional support. Five of the reporting institutions indicated that they received some form of administrative assistance. The most common form of assistance was sharing an administrative assistant between the staff, student, and faculty councils. Suggesting resourcefulness, senate chairs reported having a graduate assistant or utilizing their departmental administrative assistant.
- Having a **budget** is an important form of providing institutional support. Six of the senate chairs indicated that they had budgets. One additional senate chair indicated that they had no budget but received financial support out of the president's office. Along with providing refreshments at meetings, senate chairs indicated that their budgets provided valuable training workshops, retreats, and social activities for faculty.
- There was limited institutional support for **major committee chairs**. Two of the senate chairs indicated support for their major committee chairs and even that was problematic. Some of the institutions indicated that their vice chair or one of their major committee chairs received remuneration.

The results of this survey are comparative. The survey does not and cannot determine what is the optimum institutional support for shared governance on the campuses. It provides a summary of what everyone else is doing. CUSF commends those institutions that are able to provide a high level of support for shared governance. Those senate chairs have been provided with the resources to do their job. Conversely, there are several campuses that may need to improve their institutional support for shared governance functions.

The purpose of this survey is to assist senate chairs in determining the level of institutional support provided to them to help them carry out their shared governance functions on campus. This survey is an example of CUSF addressing its mission of "*strengthening higher education through shared governance.*"

Respectfully Submitted, May 4, 2020
Robert B. Kauffman, Ph.D.
Chair, Council of University System Faculty