



Report from the Council of University System Faculty
Board of Regents
September 10, 2013

There was a transitional CUSF Executive Committee meeting on August 1, 2013. The incoming Executive Committee members are Virletta Bryant (Vice – Chair, CSU), Bobbi Adams (Secretary, SU), Robert Kauffman (At-Large, FSU), Nagaraj Neerchal (At Large, UMBC). The first CUSF Executive Committee meeting was September 3, 2013. Finally, the first full CUSF meeting will be September 17, 2013 at Coppin State University.

The CUSF Executive committee has agreed to work with the USMSC on ways to reduce the cost of textbooks. The first annual CUSF report on shared governance was sent to the Chancellor and shared with the Presidents at the Chancellor's council on September 3, 2013. In the September 17, 2013 CUSF meeting the ad hoc committee on shared governance will report and the general body will debate that report.

Dr. Jay Zimmerman, Chair
Council of University System Faculty
Towson University
jjzimmerman@towson.edu

APPENDIX

REPORT ON THE STATE OF SHARED GOVERNANCE IN THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND 2013

CUSF Executive Committee

This report is in response to Motion 1212: Senate Chair's Annual Shared Governance Review which was passed unanimously by the General Body of CUSF at its Wednesday, January 23, 2013 meeting. The purpose of this report is to advise the Chancellor on the state of shared governance within the System. This is the first annual report. The data for this report was collected from several different sources noted below.

An oral presentation was made by the Senate Chairs of the host institution at most of the CUSF meetings during the year. In addition, the state of shared governance on the individual campuses was discussed at the Senate Chairs Meetings on December 14, 2012 and on April 26, 2013. The summaries were included in the minutes of the meetings. These summaries were utilized as input for this report. In addition, five senate chairs sent reports to CUSF. The recommendations at the end of this report are the product of discussions in general CUSF meetings and Executive committee meetings.

Major Conclusions

1. *There is diversity regarding the implementation of shared governance among the different institutions.* The approaches vary from institution to institution. For example, the Faculty Senate at FSU includes only faculty as part of its governing body. In contrast Towson includes staff and students as part of its body.
2. *Support for faculty or staff involved in shared governance.* Typically, responding institutions described the institutional resources designated to carry out shared governance as being 1-2 course release(s) for the Faculty Senate Chair. Most institutions did not have budgets but had access to funds through the Provost. Some institutions had administrative support and others reported having small stipends for student representatives.
3. *Faculty at most USM institutions were satisfied with the state of shared governance on their campuses.* Two institutions, UB and UMUC reported significant progress in implementing relatively new shared governance procedures. Both institutions were hopeful that this progress would be sustained and institutionalized. The Senate Chair at Bowie State and Coppin State Universities expressed difficulties regarding shared governance. At Salisbury University, there was a concern that so called "Consortium committees" with mixed faculty and administrative members did not meet in a timely fashion. "Most do not have procedures for electing chairs year to year, and thus they only meet when prompted by the administration. Most committees do not appear to have met in over a year. Even the Coordinating Committee has not met in a year, and it has not elected a chair."
4. *A constant theme emerging across several institutions was the need for increased transparency on the budget.* One of the senate chairs states, "My major concern, and one expressed by colleagues at our all faculty meeting, is that faculty have not been sufficiently involved in the budgeting process. As one person said the budget reflects institutional priorities. I believe there is blame on both sides. The faculty have not been proactive and the administration has not reached out to involve faculty."
5. *There are policies implemented without sufficient faculty input.* This often occurs during the

summer when faculty are not on campus.

Recommendations

1. Each institution have a budget committee which reports to the institution's senate. The charge of this committee will be to review requests for non-mandatory budget increases for each division and submit the faculty's priorities to the institution's President.
2. Each institution have in place a "summer senate" or alternate plans for reviewing and commenting on policy changes made over the summer months.
3. Each President report annually to the Chancellor on the state of shared governance at all levels of the institution's organization.
4. Each President also give a "State of the University" speech to the faculty and staff in the Fall semester outlining among other things the institutional priorities for the year. We believe that this is currently being done at most or all institutions.