

CUSF Executive Committee Meetings, 1989-1998

This file contains all available minutes of CUSF Executive Committee meetings (including some with the Senate Chairs) from the founding of CUSF through the 1997-1998 academic year. The earliest available minutes are for January 28, 1995. Many other minutes through 1998 are missing.

University of Maryland System

Council of the University System Faculty (CUSF)

Executive Committee and Chairs of the UMS Campus Senates

Minutes of the meeting of January 28, 1995

at Interactive Video Network Sites at CEES, SSU, and UB

Present: UB Site: McMahon, TSU/CUSF Chair; Arthur, CSU; Bowles, BSU/CUSF; Cohen, UMCP; Collins, UMBI; Davis, UMCP; Havas, UMAB; Hofstetter, TSU; Langdon, BSU; Lasher, UMBC/CUSF; Mandell, UMBC; Sawyer, UB; Schukoske, UB/CUSF; Shaffer-Plucinski, FSU. SSU Site: Fox, SSU/CUSF; White, SSU. CEES Site: Glibert, CEES.

Afternoon Guests: Donald N. Langenberg, UMSA; George Marx, UMSA.

The meeting was called to order at 9:20 a.m.

I. Welcome: Provost Legon welcomed the group from the UB site. He noted that faculty and administration will need to be working closely together to effectively use the new technologies. He observed that in the future, higher education will face competition from many additional sources.

II. Minutes of October 29 joint meeting: The Chair distributed minutes from the last joint meeting.

III. Principles of Periodic Review: Fox suggested an amendment to the introductory statement: "The faculty of the UMS recognize that periodic review supports the pursuit of excellence in the teaching, research/scholarship and service functions of the university."

It was observed that CUSF's policy is intended to be broad, that UMSA will draft its own policy, and that individual campuses will write their own policies which will define the relationship between the usual annual review and the periodic (three/five year) review. Faculty development should be the focus of the policy. It was noted that faculty have always been involved with this process, it is not new.

It was noted that this document would go to a committee of three provosts, three faculty members and a seventh person, to be determined, to develop commonalities. A UMSA staff member will work with the committee.

McMahon proposed amending the amendment as follows: "The faculty of the UMS, who have engaged in annual reviews, recognize that periodic review supports the pursuit of excellence in

the teaching, research/scholarship and service functions of the university." The amendment failed 7 for, 8 against. Motion then carried to approve the amendment as offered.

Mandell made a motion, which carried, to add as a second sentence: "Indeed, faculty in the UMS regularly engage in annual or other periodic reviews."

The first paragraph was approved as amended. Paragraphs/principle A was amended to add after "assessment" "of teaching, research/scholarship and service". Principle B was approved as presented.

Principle C was amended to read: "The policies and procedures of periodic review must be consistent with the preservation of academic freedom, research and scholarship. Periodic review shall not in any way alter the accepted procedures for termination of faculty members. Consistent with institutional policy and procedures, the review itself may not be grounds for dismissal of tenured faculty and any recommendation for separation must be subject to academic due process in the normal manner."

Principle D was amended to remove the word "tenured" in the first sentence. The second sentence of D was retained, and was copied into the introductory paragraph after the words "when appropriate", as the second-to-the-last sentence.

Principle E was amended to add a new "1. the review should include teaching, research/scholarship and service", renumber the following paragraphs, and shorten [new] 2. to read "a significant component of peer judgement".

Principle F was amended to read: "In order to achieve the major goals of periodic review -- the rewarding and enhancement of faculty performance and the consequent improvement of the programs to which they contribute -- faculty should be significantly involved at every step of the design of system, institutional and unit policy and procedures."

This document, as revised, will be presented to the CUSF at its March 15 meeting. The Chair will send a revised version to the campus senate chairs by February 3; the campuses are to provide comments before the March 15 meeting.

III. Retrenchment Policy: UMCP negotiated with UMSA and the Attorney General's office new common language more protective of faculty interests. Campuses may revise their policies to conform with the new language. There will be a new System document issuing a further clarification of "lack of appropriations". The campus presidents will receive this for their meeting on February 6.

IV. Legislative Agenda: Faculty-Regent Bill: UMSA will support the bill, to be introduced by Senator Dorman, to the EEA Committee. Senator Dorman said that adding a faculty member and a staff member to the board of regents would not be appropriate in the same bill.

V. Shared Governance: UMSA plans to issue a draft document that will reach the CUSF by its

March meeting.

VI. Budget: The Governor's budget includes a 1.1% increase over current funds. There are unfunded increases, such as a 2% COLA, which will require each institution to reallocate its existing funds. There also are reductions in personnel lines, which can be handled through attrition. A "pay plan" will go into effect around January 1, 1996; \$750,000 will be necessary to fund it. A \$3,500,000 bond issue is necessary for the UMAB library and medical sciences building, the renovation of Holloway Hall at Salisbury, and other projects. There has been a suggestion of delaying the COLA by six months to reduce its financial impact.

VII. Vision III: The Chancellor discussed the process for development of Visions III. There will be discussions with a number of groups. The Regents had a retreat, and then met with the presidents. By late February, UMSA expects to have a draft document to share, reflecting these themes: (1) the new realities, including budget, (2) changes in the student body, reflecting upward trends in adult and returning learners which suggest 15-20% increase in students, and (3) expectation that higher education will play a larger and larger role in economic development. UMS will be serving more students on the essentially the same resources; a 25% increase in administrative and academic activity will be necessary. Institutions that adapt will survive; ones that do not will disappear.

The governor requested UMSA's priorities for the next four years. UMSA responded and the response was distributed. It covered three broad issues: (1) assuring Marylanders to quality higher education -- affordable, available, attainable by students from diverse backgrounds; (2) advance Maryland's economic development -- increase research in areas of economic promise, respond to training and retraining needs of the work force, (3) health, welfare, environmental, social justice, to be supported by undergraduate program support, faculty and staff development and retraining, and technology. CUSF's document on Visions III contributed the term "A Community of Scholars".

The Chancellor described RPI's development of an elementary physics course and suggested that it could be broadcast around the country. At University of Pennsylvania, a professor is teaching a course on the Holocaust and used the Internet to hold discussions for the class (thereby attracting questions and comments from others outside the class). A student reported that the discussion went on seven days a week, 24 hours a day, creating 750 pages of text. The professor said that it took time, but that students essentially prepared the classroom discussion agendas, so that class preparation was reduced. The class contact is totally different. The whole discussion is on the Internet, for those who may wish to see the exchanges.

McMahon reported that Arizona State University faculty are developing models for teaching the humanities on Internet. The faculty are looking forward - and see themselves as coaches and mentors working with students across the country rather than as professors in the classroom. The issue for faculty is how to make ourselves more accessible. The contact will be more interactive, less traditional.

Havas said that the new paradigm at the medical school means that there is a lot more faculty

time to support it. It was pointed out that there was a need for investment in change.

The Chancellor noted that a high priority is for funds for technological improvement and faculty and staff retraining.

The Chancellor asked the group to figure out how to measure productivity, and agreed that it is a difficult task. Student learning is what needs to be measured. The Chancellor recounted the "Mozart argument" - that it takes as many hours now to play a Mozart symphony as it did when it was written. The focus in academia is often on the player(faculty); the effect on the audience is a different focus, and that can be delivered through CD.

The Chancellor said that the faculty leadership needs to stay ahead of the issues, to deal with them strategically rather than reactively, and suggested tenure is one of them. The Chancellor said that tenure is not under attack by any legislator specifically, but it will come up.

VIII. General Education Common Core Curriculum: MHEC looked into the issue of transferability of credits between institutions within the state. In November, Secretary Aery formed a task force to come up with a policy. The task force had only one faculty representative, Meg Ryan; other members were academic vice presidents and registrars. The original proposal was a 40 credit common core; it has been modified to 30-36 credits for two-year institutions, and 40-46 credits for senior institutions. This draft goes to MHEC for its approval in February as part of the Minimum Requirements for Degree-Granting Institutions. It includes three credits minimum of a math course, starting with college Algebra (or higher). The institutions will have to refine their requirements to meet the MHEC Core. The Chief Academic Officers signed off on the policy. After MHEC approves the policy, the Curriculum will be published in the Maryland Register. Helen Giles-Gee has stated that there has been almost no faculty input into the policy.

The Chair asked that the campus senates send comments on the Core Curriculum to the CUSF by March 31.

Motion to adjourn was made at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Schukoske, CUSF Secretary

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
Council of the University System Faculty
Monday, February 27, 1995
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)**

Present: Bowles, BSU; Cohen, UMCP; Fox, SSU; Lasher, UMBC; McMahon, TSU, Chair; Schukoske, UB; Chancellor Langenberg; Vice Chancellor Marx; Associate Vice Chancellor Giles-Gee, UMSA.

Absent: None.

The meeting was called to order at 10:11 a.m. by the Chair.

I. Executive Committee meeting:

A. Program for Periodic Review of Faculty: CUSF proposes that there be three CUSF representatives, one at-large faculty member. The representatives will come from both research and comprehensive institutions, with representation by historically black institutions.

B. UMUC Representative to CUSF: It was suggested that the Chair send a letter to UMUC's president to request that the faculty elect a non-voting liaison to CUSF. This recommendation was made because the only full-time faculty are program directors.

C. Nominations Committee: This committee, chaired by Derek Gill, will report on a slate of CUSF officers for 1995-96 at the March meeting.

D. Workload Reporting Form: There needs to be a revision of this form. The matter was referred to the Administrative Issues Committee. John Tyvoll, SSU Dept. of Natural Sciences, has volunteered to serve on the Administrative Issues Subcommittee.

E. Archives for CUSF: It was suggested that there be archives established at UMSA, and possibly at the State Archives as well.

F. Agenda for March Meeting at UMUC: Chair's report; recommendations for Periodic Review task force; reports of the Educational Policy, Legislative Committee, Nominations Committee, and Ad Hoc Committee of Massey's Response; Chancellor to address the issue of exclusion of staff from CUSF meetings

G. Legislative Committee: S.B. 606 passed the Senate.

H. April CUSF Executive Committee Meeting: The date was changed to Wednesday, April 19, since the Chancellor will be unavailable to meet on the originally scheduled date.

II. Meeting with the Chancellor:

A. March CUSF Meeting: The Chancellor will attend the March meeting to address (1) UMS staff attendance at CUSF meetings, (2) motion regarding UMUC.

B. UMUC Liaison to CUSF: The issue of representation of UMUC on CUSF was discussed. The Chancellor said that the definition of faculty is set by the Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System (IPEDS), a national Database maintained by the Department of Education, and that UMUC faculty report as full-time faculty under that system. Article II, Section 1 of the CUSF Constitution says:

"Section 1. Membership. The Council will consist of core faculty representatives elected by the faculties of the constituent institutions of the [UMS]. The faculty of each campus will determine the qualifications for, and procedures for selection of, its representatives. Core faculty: All persons holding tenure and tenure track positions who are classified as faculty (regardless of sub-classification: instructional, research and public service) and are so reported to [MHEC] through the Employee Data System."

* It was suggested that the CUSF consider whether it wishes to use the IPEDS definition or the "core faculty" definition in Article II, Section 1 of the CUSF Constitution.

C. Workload Policy: UMS has made two changes in the form in response to CUSF comments to include advisement by adding, (1) "How many majors do you advise at the department level?" (2) "How many non-majors do you advise?" The Chair said that the CUSF Administrative Issues Committee would be forwarding additional suggestions for the workload reporting form. UMS has a consultant, Greg Spangler, working on the workload data system.

D. Fall Retreat for Academic Chairs: The presidents supported the idea. Now is the time for recommending chairs to serve on a planning committee.

E. Task Force on Periodic Review of Faculty: The CUSF will be voting on the Principles of Periodic Review of Faculty at its next meeting. The task force will be composed of Ronald Legon, U.B. Provost, and another academic vice president,

Helen Giles-Gee from UMSA, and three faculty.

F. Archives for CUSF: Skip Myers, of the Chancellor's office, and Kathy Rodney, UMSA, are the person who handles archiving for the UMSA. The first secretary was Adelaide Lagnese, UMUC; second was Marilyn Oblak, third was Connie Pergerson, then the current secretary took office.

G. Retrenchment Policy: The Chancellor distributed a February 26 memorandum to the Presidents regarding provisions and statements for inclusion in retrenchment policies. The memo encourages the presidents to include clarifying language in retrenchment procedures. The clarification goes to the definitions of "program review" and "lack of appropriations".

H. General Education Core Curriculum: To "clean up" general education, all of the general education courses have to fit within COMAR classifications. Also, institutions will have to accept courses that are on the COMAR general education list. For example, UMCP has not accepted speech and foreign language courses as transferable in the past, and will have to accept the courses in the future.

The Chair pointed out that there was interest in earlier and greater faculty input into this policy. One issue for faculty to answer regarding transferable courses is, "What is college level?" The descriptions contained in the ARTSYS database are official and binding between the student and the institution.

III. Meeting with UMBC Provost Dr. Jo Anne Argersinger

A. Faculty Development Conference, "The Role of the Faculty: Enrichment and Development": UMBC is interested in hosting a conference on this issue on April 22 or 29, 1995 to share ideas regarding faculty development within the UMS. Tom Field, Modern Languages Department at UMBC, is chairing a faculty development subcommittee of the Provost's Committee on University Priorities. Ideas include: UMS faculty development issues: bringing together the faculty responsible for faculty development on each campus; the teaching techniques for new teachers; ways to rejuvenate faculty interest in teaching; new directions in teaching; lifelong learning; increasing teaching effectiveness.

The provost said that she thought there has not been

sufficient attention to counseling individual faculty members to assist in identifying ways to develop. The conference would not be geared to problem faculty but to incentives to development of faculty generally.

The format for the day was discussed. Morning: discussion of what is happening on the campuses. Lunch: national speaker. Afternoon: small groups on campus, system, and national foci on faculty development.

Dr. Argersinger will contact the AAAC for the names of the individuals responsible on the campuses. CUSF will propose several faculty who should be involved.

Meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Schukoske, Secretary

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
Council of the University System Faculty
Monday, June 26, 1995
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)**

Present: Cohen, UMCP; Fox, SSU; Lasher, UMBC; McMahon, TSU, Chair; Schukoske, UB; Chancellor Donald Langenberg; Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA; George Marx, UMSA.

Absent: Bowles, BSU.

The meeting was called to order at 10:13 a.m. by the Chair.

I. Executive Committee meeting:

A. Vision III: The Executive Committee reviewed and made changes to a draft letter prepared for the Chair to send to the Chancellor regarding the Visions III document.

B. Proposal for Strengthening Faculty Input to Regents' Decisions: It was noted that CUSF voted to support the proposal that there was a consensus on preservation of the option of pursuing a faculty regent bill.

C. Agenda for August 28 transition meeting of new and old Executive Committees: It was noted that the Executive Committee meetings are generally the last Monday of the month, the Chancellor's Council meetings are the first Monday of the month, and the CUSF meeting rotate

among weekdays. MHEC FAC, which will be chaired by Dick Keenan as UMES, meets the third Tuesday of every month.

II. Meeting with the Chancellor:

A. Proposal for Strengthening Faculty Input into Regents' Decisions: The Chair reported the CUSF vote to the Chancellor. The Chancellor will take the proposal to the Presidents in July (to see if the presidents will be comfortable with the faculty member being present during executive sessions of the Regents at which the presidents are present) and to the Regents in August. The Chancellor noted that one of the new regents strongly opposes a faculty regent bill.

B. Visions III: The Chair stated that CUSF is sending a letter with comments on the Visions III document.

C. UMSA Scheduling for 1995-96: Regent Lord and Regent McGowan resigned from the Board of Regents, and their vacancies have not been filled yet. The BOR Committees have not yet been constituted.

D. Summary of the Governor's Education Priorities issued June 15, 1995: Vice Chancellor Marx handed out "Talking Points" from the Governor's Proposed Education Initiatives. For K-12, it was clear that the construction budget is for renewal of buildings. For higher education, he indicated no changes in the higher education structure. The governor has referred to "centers of excellence", yet undefined, but referring to highlighting the strengths of the campuses. The historically black institutions are now receiving the same or better support for each full time enrollment (FTE), but have been historically underfunded and still show up behind using certain criteria.

In view of the tightness of resources, there was a question about the hiring of Dr. Gallo, expert on AIDS, as of July 1. He is bringing about 40 people with him (three non-tenure-track faculty, and post-docs). It is under discussion that in the future Dr. Gallo will be at a newly-created Institute on Human Virology at UMBI, UMAB and UM Medical System (UMMS). The \$40-50 million financial package is composed \$3 million from the state, \$1 million from Baltimore City, space donation, and substantial financial support from UMAB and UMMS. The incentive for the state to support this is the prospect of a cure for AIDS that is marketable.

The state ethics law is broadly written, with the result that faculty cannot participate in technology transfer within the confines of the law, and campus presidents cannot serve on the board of large corporations that have business relationships with the campus. The State Ethics Commission has permitted a president to serve on the board of Baltimore Gas and Electric but not on the board of Bell Atlantic.

E. Proposed UMS Policy on Family and Medical Leave for Faculty: Associate Vice Chancellor Giles-Gee handed out a June 23 draft of this prepared for the AAAC. CUSF may comment on the draft policy through their vice presidents for academic affairs and through CUSF. Part IV of the policy would allow 12 workweeks (60 days) within a calendar year. There is a separate,

existing policy on collegial leave.

F. Summer Reading: The Chancellor handed out an article by William M. Plater, "Faculty Time in the 21st Century," Change (May/June 1995).

G. Telecommunications Committee: CUSF will solicit a new member for the fall and determine whether the current members wish to continue. It was suggested that CUSF reach out to people who are interested in serving on this statewide committee.

Meeting adjourned at 11:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Schukoske, Secretary

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
Council of the University System Faculty
Monday, August 28, 1995
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)**

Present: Cohen, Chair, UMCP; Fox, SSU; Lasher, UMBC; McMahon, TSU; Rebach, UMES; Schukoske, UB; Wallinger, FSU; Chancellor Donald Langenberg; Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA; George Marx, UMSA.

Absent: Glibert, CEES.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by the chair.

I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. MEETING SCHEDULES

1. The schedule of council and executive committee meetings, as previously distributed, was approved.
2. Meeting with Senate/Forum Chairs/Presidents was tentatively set for October 21, at College Park.
3. It was decided that Joel Cohen would attend the BOR Ed. Policy Committee meetings and to solicit from the Council a representative for the meetings of the Finance Committee.

B. VISION III

Objections were raised to the phrasing of two sentences in the Preamble of the "Penultimate Draft, 8/7/95" of ATV III, and to attribution to CUSF of a paragraph which did not receive full Council discussion. It was decided to propose the following changes to the Chancellor:

1. Revise "No longer are faculty purveyors, and students consumers, of knowledge. They are partners in learning." to read: "FACULTY AND STUDENTS ARE PARTNERS IN LEARNING."

2. Delete the phrase "freed from the bonds of inflexible curricula and liberated from rigid constraints of time and place" from the last sentence. The Executive Committee asked that the Chair communicate to the Chancellor in writing these proposed changes.

C. DEPARTMENT CHAIRS WORKSHOP

It was reported that because of lack of an appropriate number of chairs, the workshop may be postponed. It will be discussed with Helen Giles-Gee later in the meeting. One objection to last year's workshop was that the luncheon speaker was clearly focused on the need to abandon tenure in higher education across the country. A balance of presentations at the workshop would be an improvement, especially in sessions attended by all participants. It was suggested that CUSF representatives to the planning committee forward names of speakers who would help to provide such balance.

D. CUSF CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS CHANGES

1. Proposed Constitution Changes

J. Alexander/Administrative Affairs Committee submitted proposals to:

a) Change Vice Chair to Chair Elect (little significant discussion).

b) Permit more than one Executive Committee member per campus (three alternatives were identified).

c) Establish term limits for Executive Committee membership.

Following discussion of issues involved in the three proposals, the Executive Committee decided not to take a position prior to full Council consideration.

2.) It was noted that two sections of the By-Laws had been omitted from the CUSF Constitution approved by the Board of Regents. That message had been sent to the Chancellor on March 28th, but there was still no reply. It was noted that the new Council (especially new members) needs a current draft, with all changes included.

E. SHARED GOVERNANCE

1. Faculty "regent" (Representation in BOR meetings) It was noted that CUSF needs to get the ear of regents, and get in on "real" conversations, which do not take place in formal meetings. The Chair reported that some regents are strongly opposed to a Faculty Regent as advanced in legislative proposals, and that Regent Billingsly believes we are better off without a vote and

would strongly oppose any such legislation. It was suggested that since we seem to have reached a mutually acceptable middle ground, we should give it a year to see how it works.

2. Statement of Principles of Shared Governance

We need to discover current status of the "Principles" statement in the System/Chancellor's office. One concern seemed to be who/how to include others besides faculty.

F. CUSF COMMITTEES

It was decided to:

- Solicit volunteers for committees in the September packet
- Maintain Council meeting lunch breaks as committee meeting times.
- Emphasize the need for campus liaisons/reporters
- Provide an orientation for new councilors

G. AGENDAS FOR COUNCIL MEETINGS

1. It was suggested that the Council focus attention on a few selected issues this year, in order to become more proactive and avoid being only reactive to policies and issues which arise/are passed down to us. Proposed "Focal Issues" included: (a)Shared Governance, (b)Changing Role of Faculty (tenure and rewards), (c)Domestic partners, and (d)Core-knowledge models for K-16 curricula. The cautionary view was expressed that we seem to work effectively and efficiently only when focused on specifics, not when we discuss abstract issues and concepts.

2. The following were suggested as September Council agenda items:

- Administrative Affairs Committee proposal to revise the Constitution
- Organization of and charges to committees
- Educational Policy Committee Report

II. MEETING WITH THE CHANCELLOR

A. DEPARTMENT CHAIRS WORKSHOP

Helen Giles-Gee reported on tentative plans to hold the Department Chairs Workshop on October 27th and 28th at the Cross Keys Inn. After considerable discussion and negotiation an affordable approach had been found. Committee members suggested format revision to allow all participants to hear discussion of key issues, like workload, which tie all issues together, and sought ways to encourage participation by more Chairs. In response to requests for a more balance approach, Dr. Giles-Gee said Prof. Richard Chait had been selected as luncheon speaker because of his national reputation and "forward-looking" approach. Executive Committee members suggested Prof. Ernst Benjamin as an additional speaker, with an equally excellent reputation, who could provide both an historical and an alternative future perspective on tenure. Dr. Giles-Gee said any suggested revisions in format or speaker need to be made rapidly. Dr. George Marx questioned the inclusion of Dr. Benjamin since, in his view, time would be better spent on Dr. Chait's presentation, given his national reputation with AAHE and his future-oriented approach to the role of faculty.

B. VISION III PREAMBLE.

The Chair proposed the revisions of the Vision III preamble agreed to earlier (See I,B above). The Chancellor agreed to make the editorial changes. The Chancellor reported that Vision III is headed for formal BOR approval at the October meeting, and that some "tweaking" could be done, but not major changes.

The intended next step is to bring the campus strategic plans "into register" with Vision III, then hold BOR hearings on each campus to explore the extent to which strategic plans "mesh" with Vision III and identify actions which deserve immediate attention. The hearings would occur during the academic year, possibly beginning as early as November or December at FSU and CEES, since both institutions are well on the way toward refined strategic plans.

C. GROWTH PROJECTIONS

In response to a question about plans to accommodate projected growth, the Chancellor noted a variety of factors contributing to a projected 20% enrollment increase if UMS maintains its market share. Proposals have ranged from little-to-no projected growth at UMCP and SSU, to the total increase being accommodated at TSU. The Chair asked the Chancellor to remind the Presidents to keep faculty updated on the issue.

D. CUSF CONSTITUTION BY-LAWS

In regard to the absence of a response to the request to include the omitted sections of the CUSF By-Laws, the Chancellor said he would look into getting it changed in time for the new edition of the Board's Policy Manual. The Chair noted the importance of a complete version of the Constitution.

E. SHARED GOVERNANCE

In response to a question about the progress of the Statement of Principles of Shared Governance, the Chancellor said it is on his "to do list," and that a revised draft will be advanced soon. In response to a question regarding CUSF representation in BOR proceedings, the Chancellor noted that the revised proposal was approved by the Board, and that the next step was for the BOR By-Laws Committee to craft procedures for implementation.

F. MHEC GEN. ED. POLICY

It was noted that the CAO responses to the policy have been sent to MHEC through the Secretary for Higher Education, and that final recommendations have been sent to the Commission. (Copies to be provided to CUSF.) Since the Fall, '96 implementation deadline has been "non-negotiable," campuses need to move rapidly in order assure their policies are consistent with the new MHEC policy. The September MHEC Gen. Ed. Committee meeting is probably the last opportunity for comment before final consideration at the Commission's September 28

meeting.

G. OTHER

The details of BOR Faculty Awards will be distributed at the September Council meeting. The Board of Regents passed a resolution reaffirming Affirmative Action. This is seen as particularly significant in light of recent California actions. The System and Regents are now on record reaffirming existing policy. The issue of non-disciplinary/interdisciplinary higher educational curricula and structure was suggested as a possible focus for CUSF. A related suggestion was to respond to the MSDE request for higher-ed. input into "core knowledge" proposals. The "Domestic Partners" issue may come to the fore in BOR discussions. The "Common Calendar" needs some adjustments to meet COMAR regulations. In some years, this will mean starting before Labor Day. The UMS budget projections for next year do not look as good as hoped, with the economy and probable tax cuts identified as the primary reasons.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Wallinger, Secretary

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
Council of the University System Faculty
Thursday, September 28, 1995
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved, as Amended, October 23, 1995**

Present: Cohen, Chair, UMCP; Glibert, CEES; Lasher, UMBC; McMahon, TSU; Rebach, UMES; Wallinger, FSU; Chancellor Donald Langenberg; UMSA; George Marx, UMSA.

Absent: None

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by the chair.

I. MEETING WITH THE CHANCELLOR

A. Vision III: The Chancellor distributed copies of latest draft of "Toward a State of Learning" (Achieving the Vision III). He noted that the changes requested in the statement attributed to CUSF and the change from "research" to "research and scholarship" (p. 3) had been accepted verbatim, and that the spirit of the requested deletion of subsequent references to faculty as "purveyors of information" (p. 8) had been incorporated. The Chancellor also noted that the next stage of the process was the development and review of institutional strategic plans, and integration/coordination with Vision III.

In response to questions about the projected 20% enrollment increase, the Chancellor identified a

number of factors included in the "formula" used to arrive at the projection; emphasized that the figure was a projection, not a prediction; and noted that the approach did not account for factors like policy changes, changing dynamics, or significant changes in the community college system. It was suggested that, in order to provide a better foundation for strategic planning to accommodate the increase, more complete data was needed (e.g. indication of the full time/part time mix included in the projection, and trends of attracting Maryland high school graduates to enrollment in UMS institution).

B. Benchmarks: It was noted that the Chancellor's Council is examining the question of alternatives to the use of "Peer Institutions" for benchmark comparisons.

C. Accountability: The Chancellor announced that MHEC is investigating ways to streamline and consolidate the accountability reporting process. The objective is to make the data-gathering and reporting task less onerous for UMS and institutions by achieving more consistency in reporting format. The Chancellor said that while the data required in various reports was valuable, the different formats made the task unnecessarily burdensome. The Chancellor also said he detected a more collaborative and cooperative attitude in MHEC, resulting in more openness and sharing of information with UMS.

D. Funding Priorities: In response to a question about the input used to decide the allocation of Enhancement funds, the Chancellor said it was the Regent's synthesis of input from the campuses, Presidents Council, Chancellor's Council, Regents' priorities, and the Governor's priorities. It was suggested to the Chancellor that problems are detected at the lowest level of the system, but that information does not boil up to the top in deciding priorities.

E. Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance: Dr. Marx distributed a "List of Attractions, Priorities for Leadership and Desirable Characteristics" to be used in the VCAF search, and requested CUSF feedback.

F. Faculty Development Awards: \$10,000 has been allocated for funding Faculty Development grants. It was noted that this is \$5,000 less than was allocated last year, that not all of the allocated funds were awarded, and that there is a need for more publicity about the results.

G. Regents Faculty Awards: Dr. Marx distributed a draft of optional plans for implementing the Regents Faculty Awards. Plan A incorporates a two-year process, with the first year used for subcommittees to develop more specific definitions and criteria, while the actual nomination and selection of award recipients would occur for the first time in the following year (1996-97). Plan B consolidates the process into one year, with nominations and development of criteria occurring simultaneously. Given the perceived need to develop criteria prior to the nomination process, the short time between the next Council meeting and the proposed nomination deadline, and the impracticality of developing precise definitions and criteria prior to mid-October, the Executive Committee chose Plan A.

H. Proposed Administrative Procedures to Govern the Operation of System-Wide Advisory Councils. Dr. Marx distributed a draft of a proposed UMS policy developed by a UMSA staff

committee chaired by Frank Komenda, at the request of the Presidents Council. Dr. Marx said the presidents needed "ground rules" for faculty and staff participation in system-wide councils, and that the intent of the policy was to establish the principle that responsibility for support of system-wide councils should be shared by UMSA and the institutions. One significant impact on CUSF would reduce the UMSA release-time reimbursement for the Chair by \$5,000, and eliminate reimbursement to institutions for the Vice Chair, the Past President, and the At-Large members of the Executive Committee, thereby reducing UMSA reimbursement costs from \$27,500 to \$10,000. Discussion included the following comments:

- This is a drastic reduction in the reimbursement for the Chair and does not account for the amount of time needed to fulfill the responsibilities of the office.
- The Chancellor perceives a problem in providing the current amount of faculty release time in light of the current scrutiny of workload.
- This is a major disincentive to shared governance.
- It has the potential to implement the principle of shared responsibility and assure participation opportunities for faculty and staff from all institutions.
- There are inadequate assurances that institutions/supervisors will provide the necessary support and permission for faculty and/or staff to participate.
- Since the proposal stipulates support for the chair and secretary of the Staff Council, this brings support for CUSS into line with support for CUSF.
- There is a need to build a case for more support for the Chair, based on the amount of time involved in the position.

I. Department Chairs Workshop: The Workshop agenda is nearly complete and all available enrollment slots have been taken. There is a need for four more group leaders/facilitators, preferably from FSU, CSC and UMES, since those institutions are not yet represented. Department chairs seeking information about participation should contact their Vice President for Academic Affairs.

II. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. It was decided to invite Maryland Higher Education Commissioner Florestano to a Council meeting of her choice, and to alert the host campus to allow preparation and appropriate reception.

B. Committee Assignments: The following tentative assignments and Chair designations were made:

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE: Larry Lasher (Chair), Bill Chapin, Adil Shamoo, Ira

Block, Kathy Fox.

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: Ira Block (Chair), Joan Langdon, Jay Alexander.

ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: Jay Alexander (Chair), Ira Block, Sam Lomonaco. (Additional members are needed)

FINANCE COMMITTEE: Marci McClive. (Additional members are needed, with a chair selected at that point.)

ISSUES COMMITTEE: Steve Rebach (Chair), Vicki Freimuth, Vince Luchsinger, Mike Wallinger, Pat Glibert, M. Jane McMahon.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: Chuck Sternheim (Chair), Alcott Arthur, George Friedman (Fall) / Trudy Somers (Spring).

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: Kathy Fox (Chair), Ray Smith. (Additional members are needed.)

C. World Wide Web: It was suggested that the CUSF Constitution, the membership list, committee membership, approved minutes, and schedules for all meetings be placed on the Web.

D. Council Meeting Agenda: The following items were placed on agenda for the October 10, 1995 CUSF Council meeting:

-- Without Executive Committee recommendation, an Administrative Affairs Committee proposal to establish a System-wide ad hoc committee to develop a definition of domestic partner.

-- Without Executive Committee recommendation, Administrative Affairs Committee proposals to amend Article III, section 1, and Article IV, Section 1 of the CUSF Constitution.

-- For discussion, the "Proposed Administrative Procedures to Govern the Operation of System-Wide Advisory Councils." (See I, H above.)

-- For information only, the "Proposed Amendment to BOR Bylaws, New Article VI, Section 4," concerning implementation of a Faculty Advisor to the Board of Regents.

Meeting adjourned at 12:45

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger, Secretary

Minutes of the Executive Committee of the

Council of the University of Maryland System
Monday, October 23, 1995
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved November 27, 1995

Present: Cohen, Chair; Glibert, CEES; Lasher, UMBC; McMahon, TSU; Rebach, UMES; Wallinger, FSU; Chancellor Donald Langenberg, UMSA; George Marx, UMSA.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by the chair.

I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes of the September 28, 1995 meeting of the Executive Committee were approved.

A. Faculty Salaries:

The Committee received from the Administrative Affairs Committee a resolution urging the Chancellor and Regents to place a higher priority on achieving the policy goal of raising faculty salaries to at least the 85th percentile. Discussion focused on the need for additional data; placing the request in the context of parity, the Four-Year Funding Plan and Vision III; and the political wisdom of a statement referring to faculty working less. Councilor Glibert was charged to work with the Administrative Affairs Committee Chair in order to refine the resolution for presentation to Council at the November meeting.

B. Administrative Procedures Governing System-Wide Advisory Councils

The Committee addressed implementation of the Council charge to draft a written response to the Chancellor urging continued UMSA support for current levels of release time for CUSF Executive Committee members. Discussion focused on the meaning of "as needed basis for a limited term," appropriate phrasing for references to the groups/councils covered by the policy, emphasis on preserving the principle of release time, appropriate phrasing for references to the amount of support currently provided by institutions, and the wisdom of requesting continued support in a time of limited funds. Councilor Rebach was charged to draft the letter.

C. Chair's Report on MHEC Consideration of UMUC Request for Waiver of Minimum Requirements

The Chair reported that the MHEC Faculty Advisory Council voted to oppose the waiver of the requirement that there be at least one full-time faculty member per concentration. Because the FAC Chair and Vice Chair were unable to attend the MHEC meeting the following day, Joel Cohen was asked to represent the FAC at the MHEC Educational Policy Committee meeting. In his presentation, Dr. Cohen made it clear that he was speaking for the FAC and not CUSF. His remarks were drawn completely from the comments at the FAC meeting. (There was a suggestion in Executive Committee that if any CUSF chair were to face a similar quandary, he/she ought to simply read a statement written by the FAC Chair.) The Chair reported that at the MHEC meeting, the issue was discussed, but no action would be taken until the January meeting of that committee. The Chair reported that the majority of the MHEC Educational Policy Committee seemed sympathetic, but not necessarily committed, to the MHEC FAC position. Secretary

Florestano had asked whether the FAC would support the waiver request if there were at least one full-time faculty member per concentration. Dr. Cohen responded that although there was no vote on that precise issue, it was his impression that it would. The Chair reported that this impression was seconded by staffer David Sumler, an MHEC representative to the FAC.

II. MEETING WITH CHANCELLOR

A. Administrative Procedures Governing System-Wide Advisory Council

The Chancellor reported that the UMSA proposal will be sent to the Chancellor's Council for discussion at the November 2 meeting. The Chair indicated he would give the CUSF response to the Chancellor for distribution to the council members.

B. Productivity

Councilor McMahan distributed copies of the William F. Massy and Andrea Wilger report, "Faculty Productivity," and Dr. Marx provided copies of an excerpt from the Taylor, Meyerson and Massy study of indices of productivity. In response to a request for clarification of the CUSF role in System efforts to define productivity, the Chancellor suggested initiating a broad-based discussion of the issue at all levels. The Chancellor indicated that, though not yet established, he envisions a long-term, widely-representative steering committee to study, propose, and revise productivity "benchmarks" by Summer, 1996. Discussion focused on the need for, and sources of information about, quality indicators. The Chancellor reported that Carol Berthold had been studying the issue for UMSA, and that her work should be consulted. Dr. Marx indicated that a significant some of the work would need to be done at the campus level as a result of aligning institutional strategic plans with Vision III.

D. Evaluating Presidents

The Chancellor reviewed past practices and procedures used in evaluating presidents, and indicated that UMSA is currently preparing a proposal for the BOR Compensation Committee to consider. The Chancellor suggested it was appropriate for CUSF, through the Chair, to provide input to that committee regarding the inclusion of faculty in the evaluation process. Discussion of evaluation procedures included the option of a periodic review by an external source, frequency of review, the appropriate level of involvement by faculty, and the evaluation of other institutional officers. Discussion of criteria included level of attention to productivity measures and achievement of institutional mission. It was suggested that CUSF focus on the faculty role in evaluation of officers, and that the UMS objective was to establish a policy that provided general criteria and procedures.

E. Shared Governance

The Chair reported that the proposal, "Shared Governance in the University of Maryland System: A Discussion Paper," had been well received by the councilors and senate chairs/presidents present at the October 21 meeting. The announced action timeline includes consideration and review by campus senates and CUSF in the immediate future, reexamination at the January Senate Chairs/Presidents meeting, and final action at the February CUSF meeting. It was noted that few substantive changes are anticipated.

III EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (continued)

A. Evaluation

During the continuation of discussion of evaluation of presidents, it was noted that, in the Chancellor's view, it is necessary to tie the evaluation to productivity. It was suggested that a past practice of a presidential self-study ought to be continued, and that the self-study might be included in the material sent to people on campus. Opposition to the idea of an external review of presidents was expressed. It was also noted that the Chancellor seemed to be looking for separate evaluation systems for presidents and other institutional officers.

B. Shared Governance

As a follow-up to the Senate Chairs/Presidents meeting, the Chair of the CUSF Educational Policy Committee will provide a draft revision of the Discussion Paper for consideration at the November Council meeting.

C. November Council Agenda

The following items were identified for inclusion on the agenda for the November 13, 1995 Council meeting.

Productivity

Shared Governance

Evaluation of Presidents and Officers

Administrative Affairs Committee Faculty Salary Resolution

Four-Year Funding Plan

Address by Secretary for Higher Education, Dr. Patricia Florestano

The meeting adjourned at 1:09 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael Wallinger

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
Council of the University System Faculty
Monday, November 27, 1995
at the University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved December 18, 1995**

Present: Cohen, Chair; Lasher, UMBC; Rebach, UMES; Wallinger, FSU; Chancellor Donald Langenberg, UMSA; George Marx, UMSA.

Absent: McMahon, TSU; Glibert, CEES.

The meeting was called to order at 10:15 AM. by the Chair.

I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. Minutes of the October 23, 1995 Executive Committee meeting were approved as submitted.

B. Faculty Advisor: The Chair reported that the BOR By-Laws Committee proposal implementing the Faculty Advisor policy was scheduled for action at the December BOR meeting. The Chair also distributed a draft copy of his remarks prepared for presentation at the meeting.

C. Administrative Procedures To Govern Operation Of System-Wide Advisory Councils: The Chair reported that the UMSA proposal was scheduled for discussion at the January Chancellor's Council meeting. The Committee discussed optional approaches the Chair might take in arguing for continuation of the present level of UMSA support for CUSF Executive Committee. No action was taken.

D. Chairs Workshop: The Committee edited and approved a draft copy of a letter to Vice Chancellor Marx expressing thanks for supporting and conducting the 1995 workshop, and urging AAAC to support the workshop as an annual event and to reorganize the financing to allow participation by a greater number of chairs.

E. Periodic Review of Faculty: Larry Lasher, a member of the UMSA Task Force on Periodic Review of Faculty, reported that the Task Force final draft had been completed, and reviewed the primary features of the proposal. The Committee decided to include the proposal in the December Council mailing, and place it on the December Council agenda for discussion.

F. Institutional CUSF Councilor Parent Bodies: The Committee briefly discussed CUSF options in the event of a disagreement among an institution's organizations as to which representative body should receive reports of CUSF activity. It was decided to recognize the campus body responsible for electing the CUSF councilors as the representative body of that faculty.

G. UMS K-16 Partnership In Learning Working Group: The Committee decided to discuss with the Chancellor the question of CUSF participation in the Working Group.

II. MEETING WITH THE CHANCELLOR

A. System-Wide Advisory Councils: During discussion of the level of release-time support for Executive Committee members, the Chair and committee members reiterated previously expressed objections, such as appropriateness of System support for legislatively mandated councils engaged in System business, the perception that UMSA is withdrawing from the commitment to shared governance, and that shifting the burden to the campuses would impose a particular hardship on the smaller campuses. The Chancellor and Dr. Marx asserted the financial problem is real and that there are insufficient funds to support both CUSS and CUSF at the prior level of support provided to CUSF. The possibility of assessing each campus a prorated fee was raised. The Chancellor indicated there is a precedent for such an unfunded mandate in the present policy of "tithing" the campuses for System operations, and that such a proposal would need to be discussed in the Presidents Council.

B. K-16 Partnership In Learning: CUSF was invited to name a representative to the UMS K-16 Partnership In Learning Working Group. The position will involve a serious time commitment. The task of the Working Group initially is to assist the school reform enterprise, help arrive at standards to be used as benchmarks in progress toward graduation, and recommend fundamental revision in BOR admission criteria. Two components were identified: setting performance standards for graduation and assessment devices to arrive at those standards.

C. Report on Chancellor's Council Agenda: The Chancellor distributed preliminary agendas for the December 4 Council of University System Presidents and Chancellor's Council meetings. In response to a question regarding assignment of issues to the two councils, the Chancellor replied that it was negotiated. The Chair requested movement of the projected enrollment increase item to the Chancellor's Council to allow CUSF inclusion in the discussion.

The Chancellor identified the projected enrollment increases and the implications of the projections on the capital budget as the most controversial item on the CUSP agenda. He said that most of the increase is projected to occur at Towson and the three HBI's, that the present capital planning probably will need to be significantly revised to provide suitable capital facilities for those institutions getting the additional students, and that capital projects at other institutions may be placed further down the line.

Other items on the CUSP agenda are the Four-Year Funding Plan, a report on Total Compensation for UMS Presidents and Officers' TAG Report, and the NCAA meeting. In response to a query, the Chair reported that CUSF had discussed the Four-Year Funding Plan, but had taken no action. The Chancellor reported the intent to urge presidents or their representatives to attend the NCAA meeting to support a reform proposal that would allow university presidents to regain control of intercollegiate athletics.

The Chancellor's Council agenda included two items: Economic Development Corporation and Revision to Common Trust Spending Policy. It was suggested formation of an economic development corporation could provide a clearinghouse for public-private joint ventures, and allow UMS to respond to urgings to become more entrepreneurial. It has been proposed to use part of the income from Common Trust investments to fund improvements, much as is done by the University of Maryland Foundation.

III. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (continued)

A. November CUSF Resolutions: The chair assumed responsibility for forwarding to the Chancellor the resolutions on "Academic Productivity" and "Faculty Salaries" as approved in the November CUSF meeting.

B. K-16 Partnership In Learning: The Chair, with Executive Committee concurrence, appointed Larry Lasher as the CUSF representative to the UMS K-16 Partnership In Learning Working Group.

C. December Council Agenda: The committee identified four items for inclusion in the agenda

for the December 14, 1995 CUSF Council meeting at Bowie State University:
Periodic Review of Faculty
Shared Governance
System-Wide Advisory Councils
Evaluation of Administrative Officers

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 P.M.
Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
Council of the University System Faculty
Monday, December 18, 1995
at the University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved January 29, 1996**

Present: Cohen, Chair; Glibert, CEES; Lasher, UMBC; McMahon, TSU; Wallinger, FSU;
Chancellor Donald Langenberg, UMSA; George Marx, UMSA; Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA.

Absent: Rebach, UMES.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 AM. by the Chair.

I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the Minutes of the November 27, 1995 Executive Committee meeting, as submitted.

B. Piloting in Shoal Waters (Carol Berthold's Presentation)

The Committee reviewed the resolution approved at the December 14, 1995 Council meeting:
"Resolved: It is the sense of the Council that, while supporting the concept of quantitative assessment of institution performance, it believes the proposed "Piloting in Shoal Waters" is not a usable model for the University of Maryland System, and directs the Executive Committee to engage in discussions with the administration aimed at developing a more appropriate model and encouraging the participation of a broader community of interests."

It was decided to discuss the issue with the Chancellor, relay serious CUSF concerns about the document, urge the development of a more appropriate model, obtain a reaction from the Chancellor and report the Chancellor's reaction to the Council.

C. Faculty Awards

The Committee discussed procedures for establishing criteria for Regent's Faculty Awards for teaching, scholarship and service. It was decided to appoint Derek Gill, James Alexander and Charles Sternheim to an ad hoc committee to establish criteria for research-university awards, and

to appoint Alcott Arthur, Trudy Somers and Kathy Fox to establish criteria for comprehensive-university awards. Committee membership will be forwarded to Dr. Helen Giles-Gee.

D. January Senate/Forum Chairs Meeting

The committee decided to place two items on the agenda for the January 27, 1996 meeting of the Executive Committee and the Senate/Forum Chairs: Periodic Review and Shared Governance. The primary meeting site will be the Columbus Center, with an IVN-linked site at Horn Point.

E. Officers Evaluation

The Committee briefly discussed the question of continued CUSF attention to evaluation of campus presidents and other officers. One view was that it is a campus issue rather than a System concern. Another view was that, at the October Senate/Forum Chairs meeting, the Chancellor had invited faculty input in the evaluation of campus officers. It was decided to ask the Chancellor for clarification and to restrict CUSF focus to the Chancellor and the presidents.

E. Shared Governance

The Committee decided to forward the CUSF-revised preliminary draft to the Staff, Students and Presidents Councils, with notification that CUSF intends to take final action at the February meeting. In the spirit of shared governance, an invitation will be issued to the Councils to forward comments to CUSF and/or to Chancellor's Council.

II. MEETING WITH CHANCELLOR:

A. K-16 Partnership in Learning

Dr. Giles-Gee, the Chancellor and the Committee briefly discussed the question of adequate incentives to encourage an appropriate level of UMS faculty involvement in the K-16 Partnership in Learning project. No action was taken.

B. Piloting in Shoal Waters

The Chair reported that Carol Berthold's presentation at the December CUSF meeting was not well received, and that the Councilors raised several objections.

1. Inadequate Data: The Chair indicated there was insufficient data for a number of indicators of a quality institution. The Chancellor noted that reliable national data is available and reported for other major indicators, such as faculty salaries. He also said that, "while some important things happening in higher education are not reflected, currently, in reliable data elected by a credible source on the basis of consistent and generally applied definitions of what those data mean," that is a "fact of life about our business," not a problem with this exercise. Instead, it raises important questions of what should be done about it. At a later point, the Chancellor said the alternatives for gathering the additional data were to spend millions gathering and compiling the missing data, or persuade some other group like AAUP or NSF to do so. He also said that basing comparisons only on the readily available data was a problem only if one accepts the argument that "if one does not have all desirable information one should have no information"-- an argument he rejected.

Others, noting the admittedly unavailable input/output data for a number of important indicators,

especially for comprehensive universities, questioned both the appropriateness of benchmarking in the absence of that data and the seeming abandonment of peer and aspirational peer institutions for comparisons. Later, concern was expressed about basing strategic planning on inadequate data, and doing so without the acknowledgment of absence of relevant data for comprehensive institutions.

The Chancellor said this study had nothing to do with peer institutions, and challenged the assertion of intent to abandon the current use of peer institutions for comparison purposes. At a later point, the Chancellor characterized the selection of peer and aspirational peer institutions as a judgmental, non-data-based process that resulted in very dissimilar institutions being included. He also said, later, that the term "peer" had been avoided because there was no commonly accepted definition, and that this study had the potential for refining the selection of comparable institutions.

2. Public Misinterpretation/Use of an Internal-Use Study: The Chair reported intertwined CUSF concerns that the 2-dimensional clustering included very dissimilar institutions in the same graph and that a higher dimensional measure should be used to compare institutions, and also that comparison of institutions within the grouping leads to very misleading conclusions, an especially dangerous consequence if the results are viewed by individuals who are susceptible to misinterpretation of the data and misuse of the comparisons. The Chancellor responded that the clearest identification of similar institutions was indicated by those closest to each other in a high dimensional space of inputs and outputs, but that it would be very hard for most non-scientists to make sense out of such information. The Chancellor also expressed incredulity that he was hearing the above mentioned fear expressed by faculty. He said a fundamental tenet of our academic community is that it engages in the search for truth, and that it does so by examining or developing data and "real facts" to determine what the data means. He also said good, honest people can reach different conclusions based on the same data, but that it was "mind boggling" to suggest that "publicly available facts" should be suppressed because there was a danger that they might be misinterpreted or misused.

The Chair responded that was not what CUSF was suggesting. Instead, the Chair said we do not believe the data has been put together in a manner which reflects what it appears to claim to reflect. The Chair reported that councilors first questioned the methodology, and then saw their concerns reinforced upon discovery of the identity of two particular institutions. In addition, the Chair said, there was a fear that the results would be construed as an assessment of the value of a university.

The Chancellor responded that the objective was to provide a service that will contain reliable comparative information that anyone can use to interpret and make judgments. He said there were two purposes: One was to provide data-based statements for "bragging" purposes because often our institutions look very good. A second purpose was to provide "diagnostic" data which allow setting priorities and arguing for funds to meet priorities, much as was done with AAUP data on faculty salaries. At a later point, the Chancellor said the only way to deny access to partial information to those who may misinterpret or misuse the information was to deny access to the data to ourselves.

3. Uses of Gathered Information: The Chancellor and Vice Chancellor indicated that the project was designed to gather information needed for data-based "benchmark" comparisons; that it would not be used for intra-system comparison of institutions; that it is a first step in refining the identification of "peer" institutions; that, given the absence of data for relevant indicators for comprehensive universities, it was most appropriate for comparison of research universities; and that clarification of the shortcomings of the data base and the relevant applications would be provided in any future presentations. The Chair and other councilors summarized the CUSF concerns about the publication of the project without adequate caveats regarding the availability of data and applicability to comprehensive institutions. The Chair also thanked the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for the clarifications of the intended use, and, in accordance with the resolution passed at the December meeting, offered CUSF assistance in refining the research design.

C. Officers Evaluation The Chair summarized the campus officer-evaluation practices reported at the December CUSF meeting, reported the Executive Committee preference to limit consideration to chancellor, vice chancellor and president positions, and requested clarification of the Chancellor's intent.

The Chancellor said he had been thinking of officers as extending down through the level of deans, and that the intent was to establish a policy to bring consistency of practices throughout system institutions. He said it could be as simple as declaring that there would be annual evaluations. He also indicated that one important consideration was whether to continue the top-down procedure currently practiced at most institutions, or to require a 360-degree procedure with evaluations from bottom and sides, as well as from the top. The Chancellor also said he had not yet decided on the appropriate procedure for drafting a policy proposal.

D. Performance Accountability: The Chair and councilors reported Council reactions to the Report of the MHEC Intersegmental Work Group on Performance Accountability. Reported reactions included concern that no mention was made of teaching; the suggestion that other minorities besides African-American should be included in the "Diversity" report; and suggested caution in the definition and measurement of "retaining" students and "facilitating transfers," in order to avoid the two measures of effectiveness working at cross purposes. The Vice Chancellor clarified the point that this proposal involves the required accountability reporting by institutions to the Maryland Higher Education Commission, and has nothing to do with what happens on campus. Campuses would report indices used to determine student learning outcomes, but teaching effectiveness measures would be determined by the campuses.

E. Shared Governance: The Chair announced Executive Committee intent to send drafts of the CUSF revisions of the Chancellor's Shared Governance document to the other councils, to invite submission of reactions to CUSF and/or to the Chancellors' Council, and to discuss the document further at the January 27 Senate Chairs meeting. The Vice Chancellor and Associate Vice Chancellor questioned the appropriateness of CUSF drafting a system policy on shared governance. In response, the Chair clarified the point that this would be CUSF's response to the Chancellor's document.

F. Systemwide Councils: The issue is on the January Chancellor's Council agenda. The Chair reiterated concern about the inadequacy of support for CUSF.

G. ATV III Productivity Indicators: The Vice Chancellor clarified the productivity indicators listed in "Proposed Accountability Measures for Vision III" (memo to AAAC, December 7, 1995) as a "first step," thus subject to addition, deletion and revision.

H. Periodic Review of Faculty: The Vice Chancellor reported that AAAC had further discussed a number of items in the draft policy, but had taken no action.

I. Retrenchment Policy: In response to a question about the delay in approval of retrenchment policies by the Attorney General's Office, Dr. Giles Gee reported that additional "technical" questions had been raised and need to be discussed.

J. Chancellor's Council Agenda: The Chancellor reported that the agenda had not yet been determined.

III. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (continued)

A. Systemwide Councils: Committee members reported on discussions with their presidents regarding support for optional counter proposals to maintain adequate System support for the CUSF Executive Committee. In light of those reports, the Committee discussed the features of a potential counter proposal and the appropriate procedure for advancing it in Chancellor's Council. No formal action was taken.

B. January Council Agenda: Two items were placed on the agenda for the January 12, 1996 Council meeting: Chair's report on discussion of Piloting in Shoal Waters, and Privatization of UMAB Medical School

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael J. Wallinger

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
Council of the University System Faculty
Monday, January 29, 1996
at the University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved February 26, 1996**

Present: Cohen, Chair; Glibert, CEES; Lasher, UMBC; McMahon, TSU; Wallinger, FSU;
Chancellor Donald Langenberg, UMSA; George Marx, UMSA; Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA.

Absent: Rebach, UMES

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 AM. by the Chair.

I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. Minutes of December 18, 1995 were approved as editorially amended.

B. Piloting in Shoal Waters:

The Committee considered various options for reporting to Council on Executive Committee discussions with the Chancellor regarding the Benchmarking project. In light of discussions at the December Executive Committee meeting and the Chancellor's presentation at the January Senate Presidents/Chairs meeting, it was decided to report Executive Committee satisfaction with the Chancellor's response to concerns expressed at the November Council meeting.

C. Legislative Affairs:

The Chair reported on legislation proposals affecting UMS faculty.

1. SB1 (Early Retirement): Legislation has been introduced to permit early retirement of some state employees. Some of the salient features are that it applies to employees in the Employees Retirement System and the Employees Pension System, but, in its present form, does not apply to the Teachers Retirement and Pension Systems, hence excludes faculty. Eligible employees over 50, with at least 25 years of service, could be credited an additional 5 years toward retirement. The agencies involved would lose 60% of all lines or PINs of retirees, as well as 60% of the corresponding salaries. Reportedly, some members of the Senate committee are amenable to adding faculty eligibility. The Committee decided to place the issue on the February Council agenda and invite Frank Komenda to brief us on the issue.

2. HB252 (Public-Private Partnerships): The Chair reported that this bill is the same as the old "Conflict of Interest" bill with a new title.

3. SB229 (Faculty Regent): The Chair reported that Senator Ida Rubin has sponsored a bill to place two faculty on the Board of Regents as voting members. The Committee decided to place the issue on the February Council agenda, with a recommendation that CUSF take no position on the bill.

D. Faculty Awards:

The Chair reported that Derrick Gill has resigned from CUSF due to Sabbatical Leave for the remainder of his term. The Committee decided to appoint Sam Lomonaco (UMBC) to the Ad Hoc Committee charged with setting criteria for Regents' Faculty Awards for Research Universities.

E. Shared Governance:

The Committee reviewed revisions of the Shared Governance proposal passed at the December CUSF meeting and the January Senate Presidents/Chairs meeting. It was decided discuss the more significant changes with the Chancellor.

F. MHEC Waiver for UMUC:

The chair reported that the MHEC Educational Policy Committee voted to allow UMUC to count 58 administrators as faculty, and granted the waiver of the requirement that 50% of courses be taught by fulltime faculty. CUSF opposition was registered in the MHEC Faculty Advisory Council and reflected in the FAC opposition to the waiver. The argument was that if the individuals are counted as faculty, they ought to be accorded faculty titles and rights, especially academic freedom. Since CUSF is advisory to the Chancellor, it was decided that it is inappropriate for CUSF to testify at the MHEC Commission meeting. The Chair will report on the issue at the February Council meeting.

II. MEETING WITH CHANCELLOR

A. Shared Governance:

The Chair informed the Chancellor of CUSF and Senate Presidents/Chair revisions in the Shared Governance proposal, with emphasis on the requirement that, in the event of disagreement between the president and constituent bodies, there would be full disclosure of positions which became part of the permanent record. The Chancellor expressed no opposition to the changes. In response to questions, the Chancellor said the proposal would next go to Chancellor's Council and then to the Board of Regents for approval. He also agreed that shared governance concept would become part of the evaluation process for presidents.

B. Learning Paradigm:

The Chancellor and the Executive Committee continued discussion of the potential for a UMS shift from the instructional to a learning paradigm initiated at the Senate Presidents/Chairs meeting. Several Councilors noted that a number of efforts already are underway which implement the shift, and that the keys to more widespread implementation are the removal of institutional structural barriers, adequate incentives for faculty to incorporate the shift, and the ability to adequately assess and measure learning outcomes. Frequent reference was made to the need for flexibility and the need to adapt to a variety of student learning styles.

In response to a questions about the next step, the Chancellor raised the possibility of a System-wide conference. All agreed that such a conference would need to include all those with an impact on the potential implementation, such as faculty who have successfully implemented the shift, registrars, admissions officers, deans, department heads. Dr. Marx suggested that such a shift is a logical extension of the current K-16 Partnership In Learning initiative. The Chancellor noted that the initiative must come from the faculty, and that the UMSA role would be to facilitate, not impose, the shift.

C. Chancellor's Council Agenda:

The Chancellor distributed copies of the tentative agenda for the February Chancellor's Council. It includes, among other items, an update on progress toward achieving Vision III and a status report on the Domestic Partners issue. Noting the absence of the System-Wide Councils issue and the imminence of CUSF officer nominations, the Chair requested the item be added to the agenda. The Chancellor agreed to do so.

D. SB1 (Early Retirement):

Dr. Marx clarified provisions of the Early Retirement Bill (SB1) and the retirement systems included. To be eligible, the employee must be at least 50 years old, have at least 25 years of service, and leave active employment by September 30. Two months of credit toward retirement would be added for every year of service. The agency would relinquish the PIN and the funding for the position, and get back 60% of the relinquished PIN's and 60% of money. Faculty are not included in the bill, and it seems very unlikely that faculty in TIAA-CREF would ever be included in a state early retirement program. If passed, agencies and institutions would not have an option whether to participate.

The Chancellor suggested that it is not desirable to try to include faculty in this bill, as written. He also said UMSA is considering proposing a separate faculty retirement bill, but not this year.

E. Department Chairs Workshop:

Dr. Giles-Gee reported that the Academic Vice Presidents had agreed to support an annual Department Chairs Workshop if the cost is held down. She noted that campus faculty development personnel, as well as chairs should be included in the in the planning process. She mentioned Adele Berlin and Dean Esslinger as potential representatives of faculty development programs, and requested that CUSF recommend four department chairs to assist in the planning for the 1996 workshop. Dr. Giles-Gee identified faculty service as a possible focus and distributed a Draft Report of the "IUPUI Task Force On Service."

III. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (Continued)

A. Department Chairs Workshop:

The Executive Committee identified several department chairs to contact and inquire about their willingness to serve on the planning committee for the 1996 Department Chairs Workshop. The list included Joan Langdon, BSU; M. Jane McMahon, TSU; Steve Rebach, UMES; Pat Glibert, CEES; Carol Hess-Vait, UMBC; David Morton, FSU; Rosemary Jagus, UMBI; and Madilyn Fletcher, UMBI. In addition, Adele Berlin, UMCP, and Dean Esslinger, TSU, will be representing AAAC on the committee.

B. February Council Agenda:

The Executive Committee identified the following items for inclusion on the Agenda for the February 12 CUSF meeting at CSC:

Shared Governance

Periodic Review

Piloting in Shoal Waters

Learning Paradigm.

The meeting adjourned at 12:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
Council of the University of Maryland System
Monday, February 26, 1996
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved As Submitted, March 25, 1996**

Present: Cohen, Chair; Glibert, CEES; Lasher, UMBC; McMahon, TSU; Rebach, UMES; Wallinger, FSU; Chancellor Donald Langenberg, UMSA; George Marx, UMSA; Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by the Chair.

I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. Minutes of January 29 meeting were approved as submitted.

B. Four-Year Funding Plan:

The Chair announced a special BOR meeting to act on the Four Year Funding Plan, scheduled for March 4, 1996, and initiated a discussion of the CUSF response to the plan. After considerable discussion, it was decided the CUSF response should include the following features:

1. Restrict comments to aspects of the plan directly addressing faculty concerns, or indirectly impacting faculty.
2. Express support for the concept of system-wide advance planning.
3. Express cautious appreciation for what appears to be efforts toward achieving the 85th percentile for faculty salaries, while also noting the inadequacy of funds to significantly reduce the gap.
4. Express appreciation for attention to technology and faculty development.
5. Note the strong potential that a combination of capital project underfunding, 20% enrollment growth, unfunded mandates, and caps on tuition and fees will significantly erode the quality of education and achievement of Vision III goals.

C. Productivity Indicators:

The Chair suggested the need to advance CUSF reactions to the proposed Productivity Indicators, with specific attention to proposing additional indicators. Discussion included the following:

1. There is an absence of indicators addressing quality of education.
2. There is an absence of indicators addressing potential productivity resulting from new technology. Possibilities mentioned include:
 - number of computers (connected to internet) per student;
 - number of computers (connected to internet) per faculty member;
 - number of IVAN sites per campus;
 - number of courses taught on IVAN;
 - number of articles "published" on line;
3. There is a problem with the graduation-rate indicator solely based on full-time students.

4. A possible indicator of faculty productivity that is closer to the "learning paradigm" is number of student credit hours in independent research per faculty member.
5. There are major structural and historical barriers to achieving a 20% increase.
 - e.g. for an institution with a past history of major efforts to increase research grants, a further 20% increase is unattainable, and shifting that share of the system goal to other institutions makes it equally unattainable for them.
 - e.g. limited size and number of classrooms may be a major barrier to achieving greater faculty productivity.
6. There is considerable ambiguity in appropriate interpretation of the "possible" indicator regarding interlibrary loans.

II. MEETING WITH THE CHANCELLOR

A. Four Year Funding Plan: The Chair and councilors summarized for the Chancellor the points to be included in the CUSF response.

One councillor noted that there seems to be no incentive for individual campuses that have been achieving increased productivity to further increase efforts for the sake of system productivity measures. Dr. Marx responded that there was a "small" amount of discretionary money which the Chancellor could use to reward such behavior, but that to increase it would decrease the amount available to the campuses. When the Chancellor asked if the councilor preferred that the prorata allocation to the campuses be diverted to provision of such incentives, the councilor said yes, and the Chair said no.

The Chair requested clarification of a purported policy of reducing the number of out of state students. The Chancellor and Dr. Marx said the projected reduction was in the percentage of out of state students, not in absolute numbers. They said that in light of the projected 20% increase in students, the decision was to service and maintain the UMS market share of in-state students, and that, given limited resources, the impact would be a reduction in the percentage of out-of-state students. They also said that since calculation of "full cost tuition" does not include capital expenditures, even at 103% of full cost tuition, out-of-state students are not a "money maker."

B. Productivity Indicators:

The Chair and councilors summarized their reactions and suggested additions to the productivity indicators. Discussion included the point that, while faculty and student use of the internet can significantly increase productivity, there doesn't seem to be a meaningful quantifiable measure of the gain in productivity, other than number of students and faculty connected.

C. Early Retirement:

The Chair noted that the UMS action regarding the early retirement bill was a hot topic on campuses, and inquired about progress in establishing the committee to draft the legislation for next year. Chancellor said the committee had not yet been formed, and assured that CUSF would be represented on the committee.

Dr. Marx distributed copies of a 1991 UMS Retirement Incentive Program report, and

suggested it would be a good starting point. He said that, in light of projected enrollment increases, the current state early retirement bill was not feasible for UMS because it is designed as a management tool to decrease personnel and costs. He also said that an acceptable proposal would need to be designed as a management tool to address UMS needs, not as a faculty benefit proposal.

Several councilors noted that the 40% recovery rate of the current legislation could have decimated their departments, and suggested the need to spread the loss of positions and funds across the campus. The Chancellor suggested spreading the loss across the system, since the average faculty age is significantly higher on some campuses than on others. In response to a question, the Chancellor said there was a good chance that there would be "small" loss since Senators Cade and Hoffman seem to appreciate the special circumstances facing the UMS.

D. Shared Governance:

Dr. Marx said the Shared Governance proposal will not be on the March Chancellor's Council agenda because there has not yet been any response from either the Staff or Student Councils.

E. Systemwide Councils:

The Chair relayed CUSF approval of the proposal whereby UMSA would provide \$1800 and the presidents would provide \$700 per course release. In response to a question whether it was "suggested" or "required" that the presidents provide the \$700 support, Dr. Marx responded the costs per course vary across the campuses, and that the presidents agreed to "share the costs" by providing whatever was necessary beyond the \$1800 provided by UMSA.

F. Chancellor's Council:

The Chancellor distributed copies of the tentative agenda for the March 4 meeting of the Chancellor's Council, and noted that it is a short agenda to accommodate the special meeting of the Board of Regents the same day. The Systemwide Councils agreement will be added to the agenda under "Announcements."

G. Faculty Appointments to UMS Committees:

Dr. Giles-Gee and the Executive Committee reviewed the nominees for the Chairs Workshop Planning Committee. Those agreeing to serve are Joan Langdon, BSU; M. Jane McMahon, TSU; Steve Rebach, UMES; Henry Bullamore, FSU; Madilyn Fletcher, UMBI; Adelle Berlin, UMCP; and Dean Esslinger, TSU. Carol Hess-Vait, UMBC, is yet to be contacted.

Dr. Giles-Gee agreed to add Ira Block, UMCP, to the committee examining information in faculty handbooks and the standard letters of appointment for faculty contracts.

III. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (Continued)

A. Periodic Review:

A request was made for "clean" copies of the Periodic Review and the Shared Governance, which contain all the changes. The Chair will supply them.

B. Privatization/Shared Governance:

The Committee addressed Council's charge to consider how best to address the absence of consultation regarding the privatization of the UMAB Medical School and Hospital and the establishment of the Virology Institute. It was suggested that, since one news article that may have misquoted the UMAB president was the impetus for the privatization controversy, caution is needed, lest we "blow it out of proportion." It was decided that Dr. Lasher would draft a letter to the Chancellor to be included on the agenda for the March CUSF meeting. It was decided that the letter should protest the lack of consultation regarding the Virology Institute; suggest the need for consultation regarding the privatization issue; stress the need for examination of systemwide implications for faculty and other campuses if UMAB were to withdraw from the UMS; and note that the CUSF advisory function cannot be accomplished without consultation.

C. March Council Agenda:

The Executive Committee identified the following items for inclusion on the Agenda for the March 12 CUSF meeting at UMAB:

Chair's Report

Executive Committee Report

UMAB Issue

Nominations Committee (Chair Candidates)

D. Domestic Partners:

The Chair reviewed the general tone and substance of testimony given during the hearings on the Domestic Partners issue. He reported that the majority of comments were favorable, and that opposition tended to be based on moral grounds, to address the definition and to raise the question of cost.

The meeting adjourned at 12:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
Council of the University of Maryland System
Monday, March 25, 1996
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved as Submitted, May 2, 1996**

Present: Cohen, Chair; Glibert, CEES; Lasher, UMBC; McMahon, TSU; Wallinger, FSU;
Chancellor Donald Langenberg, UMSA; George Marx, UMSA; Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA.

Absent: Rebach, UMES;

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by the Chair.

I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. Minutes of the February 26, 1996 meeting were approved as submitted.

B. UMUC Waiver:

The Chair reviewed the history and issues involved leading to MHEC approval of a waiver of the requirement that 50% of courses be taught by full time faculty. Reportedly, the waiver was based on MHEC recognition as "faculty" for more than fifty individuals at UMUC who teach nine credits per term, but are on yearly administrative contracts. Reportedly, MHEC approved a resolution urging the Board of Regents to study the question. The phrasing of the resolution is currently unknown because official minutes have not yet been published. It was decided to seek the Chancellor's reaction to the issue.

C. UMAB -- Chancellor's Response to CUSF Correspondence:

The Chair distributed copies (dated March 12, 1996) of the Chancellor's response to CUSF correspondence regarding lack of consultation prior to establishment of the Institute for Human Virology, and in anticipation of proposed "restructuring" the Medical School. Committee discussion addressed the question of whether these were local or System concerns. It was decided to distribute the Chancellor's letter and to ask the Chancellor to keep the CUSF leadership informed, thereby allowing determination of potential impact on system faculty.

D. Periodic Review:

The Chair distributed, and the Committee revised, a rough draft of a letter to the Senate Chairs regarding the AAAC draft of the proposed UMS Periodic Review policy. Discussion centered on the amendments proposed by CUSF but omitted in the AAAC proposal.

In accord with CUSF actions at the March meeting, it was decided to raise three issues with the Chancellor: application to all full time faculty, rather than only to tenured faculty; substituting "significantly deficient in performance" for "not meeting expectations" as the standard for triggering out-of-cycle reviews; and the question of system-prescribed policy, versus campus option, regarding provision of a faculty advocate in meetings called to devise a "development

E. Dr. McMahon inquired about the propriety of staying on the Chairs Workshop Committee, in light of her appointment as Associate Provost, Towson State University, effective July 1, 1996. The Committee congratulated Dr. McMahon and reaffirmed her membership on the Department Chairs Workshop Planning Committee as a CUSF representative.

II. MEETING WITH THE CHANCELLOR

A. UMUC Waiver:

The Chair reviewed the MHEC ruling that approximately 55 individuals at UMUC would be considered full time faculty, and MHEC FAC objections, including concerns about academic freedom for "faculty" when their contract stipulates service "at pleasure of the president." The Chair also summarized a letter from an individual from UMUC, proposing, among other things, reinstatement of UMUC Area Directors to Lecturer positions.

The Chair noted the CUSF charge to discuss the issue with the Chancellor, and suggested this proposal constituted a compromise that might reduce some of the tension, without impinging on UMUC operations and flexibility. It was noted that "Lecturer" is a faculty title recognized by the Board of Regents in the ART document, and, while it would not provide for tenure, it would provide a level of due process and a degree of academic freedom appropriate for those functioning as faculty. It also was noted that the change of title to Lecturer would constitute a change in IPED reporting classification, thus allowing full representation in CUSF for UMUC faculty.

Regarding the question of whether "serving at the discretion of the president" is an enforceable condition for a one-year contract, Dr. Marx noted that a yearly contract is a property right which cannot be denied for unlawful reasons. He interpreted this to mean that, regardless of a presidential-discretion clause, one cannot be fired for exercising one's First Amendment rights.

The Chancellor said he had no objection to raising the issue if it would settle the matter. A suggestion was to delay action until availability of the MHEC amendment regarding BOR attention to the matter. Dr. Marx summarized the immediate concern as a CUSF request, regardless of the wording of the MHEC amendment, to add the title "Lecturer" for the UMUC personnel, and to explore the issue of deleting the condition of service at the discretion of the president from the contracts.

B. UMAB -- Chancellor's Response to CUSF Correspondence:

The Chair acknowledged and thanked the Chancellor for his response to CUSF correspondence regarding consultation on issues like establishment of the Virology Institute and "privatization" of the UMAB Medical School. The Chair noted occasional fine lines between campus and system issues, and that campus actions may have repercussions for the system. In that light, the Chair reiterated a request that the CUSF Executive Committee be kept informed of campus initiatives, such as "restructuring" the Medical School, which have wider System Dr. Marx said that the appearance of items like this on previously distributed AAAC agendas and Chancellor's Council agendas is one means for keeping the CUSF leadership informed of upcoming issues, thereby allowing requests for further information to be taken to CUSF. One response was that sometimes the items do not appear on the formal agendas.

C. Periodic Review:

Dr. Marx reviewed the history of development of the proposed policy on Periodic Review, noted a belief that a satisfactory compromise had been reached between AAAC and CUSF, and said that some of the most recent CUSF amendments had been rejected because, in the view of AAAC, they "constituted a dramatic change in the nature of the document." The discussion focused on three topics. 1. Review of non-tenure-track faculty: Dr. Marx said periodic review of non-tenure-track faculty occurs yearly, since they are appointed on a year-to-year basis. In response to the note that some faculty are on onger-term contracts, Dr. Marx reiterated the point that they are fixed-term contracts, occasioning review by the "appropriate appointing authority" at the end of each contract term. In response to the point that, under this policy, some faculty cannot experience the rewards of a favorable review, Dr. Marx noted that there is nothing in the policy that precludes a campus from rewarding such faculty on the basis of merit.

It was noted that some Councilors were concerned that a number of contractual faculty are not undergoing any kind of systematic peer evaluation. Dr. Marx responded that this issue ought not to be addressed in this policy. It was suggested that there is a need to gather information on campus evaluation practices and policies for non-tenure-track faculty, and on the extent of compliance with UMS policies on faculty evaluation. It also was suggested that peer review needs to be a part of those evaluation policies. At a later point, Dr. Giles-Gee said that the "prerequisites" of closer attention to evaluation policies and more support for development activities, which she had orally noted at the CUSF meeting, had now been integrated into the Preamble of the Periodic Review Policy.

2. Not-Meet-Expectations Provision: It was noted that, in the view of CUSF, the phrase "not meeting expectations" is too nebulous and that, since it comes from the Workload Policy, it refers only to quantitative measures rather than to appropriate qualitative measures. In this light, it was suggested that "significantly deficient in performance" was a more appropriate standard. Dr. Marx responded that he would have to look at it in context, but that he did not anticipate a serious problem in substituting "significantly deficient in performance." The Chancellor cautioned against substituting a new phrase for one that already exists in a formally approved document, since that requires two different interpretation requirements. The Chancellor also noted the option of a footnote in the Periodic Review policy specifying a qualitative interpretation of "not meeting expectations."

3. Faculty Advocate: Dr. Marx noted that there is nothing in the document to preclude a campus practice of including a faculty advocate, but also said AAAC strongly opposed it because inclusion of an advocate would turn a staff development activity into an adversarial proceeding. It was suggested that benefits of an advocate, or mentor, would be reduced misunderstanding of provisions of the development plan and assistance in implementation. The Chancellor said an option for assuring accuracy of understanding may be to make the development-plan meeting a four-person group, with provision for an "advisor" for the department chair as well as one for the faculty member.

D. Chancellor's Council:

The Chancellor distributed copies of the tentative agenda for the April 3, 1996 Chancellor's Council. Discussion of tentative agenda items included:

1. Shared Governance: Though it is on the agenda, Dr. Marx said that neither the Student, nor Staff councils had signed off on it yet, and that UMSA would not move forward with action until they had done so. The Chair said the only revision suggestion he was aware of was a CUSS desire to include long-term contractual employees among the groups to be consulted. The suggestion was made to set a deadline for Student and Staff councils to respond.

2. Domestic Partners: The Chair reported that the Ad Hoc Committee on Domestic Partners Recommendations intended to formulate its report and forward it to the Board of Regents as an Information/Discussion item for the April 12 BOR meeting. Since it will be made "public" prior to that point, the Chair will distribute the recommendations at the April 10, 1996 CUSF meeting.

3. Legislative Session: In response to questions, it was reported that SB1 (Early Retirement bill), with application to UMS expunged, probably would pass in both houses of the Legislature.

E. Educational Policy Committee:

1. Minority Enrollment and Minority Achievement: Dr. Marx noted that an upcoming report would indicate that there is a likely increase in minority enrollment from the present 30% to a projected 37%; that our retention rate for minorities is not as good as it is for non-minorities; that the economic future of Maryland requires that we do something about the discrepancy in the graduation rates for the two groups; and that this would require major changes on the part of faculty. The Chancellor elaborated on research showing that gender and minority performance "gaps" can be closed solely by changes in faculty behavior, thus suggesting no need for restructuring higher education to achieve the necessary improvement in performance.

2. Change in Reward Structure for Faculty: Dr. Marx said the K-16 Initiative is going to require more active involvement by UMS faculty, and for that to occur, UMS needs to reexamine how faculty are assigned, rewarded, and given recognition for such

F. Executive Committee Meeting: Due to the Chancellor's absence, the date and time of the next Executive Committee meeting was changed to 9:00 A.M., May 2, 1996.

G. Tenure:

Dr. Giles-Gee distributed copies of an AAHE report, "An Inventory of Faculty Employment Policies" and an article from the Charleston, S. C. Post and Courier, "Issue of Tenure Under Scrutiny in S. C." The Chancellor distributed copies of correspondence from the Association of American Universities which corrects inaccurate reports that the University of Minnesota is considering abolishing tenure.

III. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (Continued)

A. Periodic Review: The Committee further revised the letter to the Senate Chairs in order to reflect the new understanding of AAAC reasons for objection to inclusion of a faculty advocate.

B. April Council Agenda:

The Executive Committee identified the following items for inclusion on the Agenda for the April 10, 1996 CUSF meeting at MBI: Chair's Report: Domestic Partners Executive Committee Report: UMUC, Periodic Review, Letter from Chancellor re. UMAB
Nominations Committee: Chair Election
New Business (if any)

C. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 1:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
University of Maryland System
Council of University System Faculty
Thursday, May 2, 1996
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved as amended, May 20, 1996**

Present: J. Cohen, Chair; J. Alexander, Chair Elect; M. J. McMahon, TSU; L. Lasher, UMBC; P. Glibert, CEES; G. Marx, UMSA; Chancellor Donald Langenberg, UMSA.

Absent: M. Wallinger, FSU; S. Rebach, UMES.

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:40 A.M..

I. MEETING WITH CHANCELLOR

A. Periodic Review: The chair presented the three changes proposed by CUSF in the Periodic Review document. Drs. Marx and Langenberg agreed to explore the possibility of inserting additional language in the "failing to meet expectations" clause. Language suggested included "substantially" or "materially." On the question of provisions for a faculty advocate, the point was made that there is nothing to preclude such an arrangement in the document and that any campus could include such a provision as a part of its policy. On the question of extending the proposed review process to all faculty, it was pointed out that the AAAC had specifically rejected that proposal and that while there was nothing to preclude an approach to the larger question of the policy and procedures extant for the review of term faculty, this was not the place to raise it. The point was made that the process by which this document was developed was a good one, with more than adequate voice for all constituents, and that it would be injurious for CUSF to take an adamant position on an issue which had been considered in both the task force which wrote the policy and the AAAC.

The proposal will go forward to the Chancellor's Council, the BOR Education Policy Committee and the full Board this year, with the change in language discussed above.

B. University College: There was discussion of MHEC's action on the question of full-time faculty at University College. The chair pointed out that the MHEC resolution calls for System Administration to continue to study the question.

Three other questions are on-going:

1. the language of the appointment letter in the college ("at the pleasure of the president," with no indication of the term of the appointment)
2. necessary changes in title to "lecturer"
3. the IPEDS classification of U. C. faculty

The Chancellor had just received the request from MHEC to resolve the situation and will be

exploring this matter.

C. Shared Governance: the chair indicated that he had been unable to elicit a definitive response from CUSS to the shared governance document. He pointed out that there had been some confusion since the initial response of CUSS was to an earlier version of the document. The student council has endorsed the document. Final action will have to wait until the fall; the chair will continue to seek a response from CUSS.

D. Chancellor's Council Agenda Dr. Marx reviewed the agenda for the May 6th Chancellor's Council meeting with some discussion of individual items.

E. TIAA/CREF Spousal Health Benefits: A question was raised and discussed about the problem of spousal health benefits for retirees in the TIAA system. Presently, those benefits are much smaller than for those in the retirement or pension systems. It was pointed out that the state retirement system presently has this question under consideration. There was general agreement that this issue would be worth pursuing by CUSF.

F. Retirement Incentives: The University is under mandate to develop a retirement incentive proposal for possible inclusion in legislation to go to the general assembly next year. System will appoint a task force to develop this proposal by August 15, 1996 for inclusion in the governor's legislative package. The task force will be chaired by the director of human resources and include: the Associate Vice Chancellor for State Relations, two representatives from CUSF; two representatives from CUSS; two academic vice presidents; two administrative vice presidents; and a representative from the Office of the Attorney General. Representatives will be chosen to ensure maximum representation of System institutions. Input and representation from Morgan State and St. Mary's College will be sought.

G. Tuition Waiver for D.C. Residents: There was some discussion of possibility of offering a tuition waiver to District students given the possibility of UDC becoming a two year institution. Some consideration was given to the possibility of a discussion with George Mason University on this question, and possibly Howard University.

H. There was a brief discussion of the newly adopted federal budget.

I. Presidential Appointments: A brief discussion of the newly appointed president--William C. Merwyn--of Salisbury State followed. This discussion led to a conversation about the proper role of the CUSF chair as faculty representative to the BOR. There was general agreement that the chair ought to reflect system-wide views and concerns and ought not to be in the position of representing any particular group of faculty.

II. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. Membership: Various questions about membership were raised and discussed, the discussion focussing finally on the question of providing for more interaction among CUSF members. The proposal was made and agreed to that members ought to submit a brief statement (or vitae) to be

circulated for everyone's information. This possibility should be pursued by the incoming executive committee.

B. New Members: It was agreed that new members should be invited to the June CUSF meeting. Present members will be encouraged to do so.

C. Domestic Partners: the BOR committee on domestic partners was distributed and will be on the agenda for the June CUSF meeting.

D. Non Tenure-Track, Full-Time Faculty. Pursuant to a discussion at the last CUSF meeting, the committee considered a brief discussion paper on "Issues for Full-Time Faculty Not on Tenure Track prepared by Marci McClive of FSU. The committee decided to request Dr. McClive for further refinement and focussing of the issues with recommendations for possible action by CUSF.

The meeting was adjourned at noon.

Respectfully Submitted,

Larry Lasher

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
University of Maryland System
Council of University System Faculty
Monday, May 20, 1996
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved, as Amended, June 24, 1996**

Present: Lasher, Vice Chair, UMBC; McMahon, TSU; Rebach, UMES; Wallinger, FSU; Chancellor Donald Langenberg, UMSA; George Marx, UMSA; Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA; Alexander, Chair Elect.

Absent: Cohen, Chair; Glibert, CEES.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Vice Chair Lasher.

I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. Minutes of the April (May 2), 1996 meeting were amended to list Rebach and Wallinger as absent, and were approved as amended.

B. Periodic/Comprehensive Review: The Committee briefly discussed the Vice Chair's presentation of Council position at the BOR Educational Policy Committee meeting, May 21, 1996.

C. Early Retirement Task Force: It was announced that, upon request, the Vice Chair had submitted four CUSF nominees for the UMSA Task Force charged with drafting early-retirement legislation to be submitted by August 1, 1996: James Alexander, Joan Langdon, Vince Luchsinger, and Steve Rebach. Alexander and Langdon were selected as the CUSF representatives.

D. June Council Agenda: The Committee identified several potential agenda items for the June Council meeting at UMES.

- Report on Regent's Faculty Awards
- Report on Faculty Contracts
- Creation of discussion groups for consideration of non-tenure-track-faculty issues
- Discussion of committee structure, membership and procedures
- Inequity of spousal medical benefits for TIAA-CREF retirees

E. 1996-97 Council Membership: Chair Elect Alexander noted that names, addresses and phone/fax numbers of new and continuing CUSF Councilors and Senate Presidents/Chairs need to be provided to him and to the CUSF Secretary, Mike Wallinger.

F. Issues for Meeting With the Chancellor: The Committee identified several issues to raise during the meeting with the Chancellor:

- Time lines for Institutional Comprehensive Review policies.
- Progress of UMSA and BOR consideration of Shared Governance proposal.
- Time to Degree report included as an Information Item in the BOR Educational Policy Committee May II.

MEETING WITH CHANCELLOR

A. Chancellor's Council Agenda: Though not yet finalized, the agenda for the next Chancellor's Council meeting will include discussion of Regent's-Initiative funds for institutional advancement, and allocation of Regent's-Initiative funds to the various available options.

B. Presidents Council Agenda: According to Dr. Marx, a mandated report on System/Institutional identity will be discussed in Presidents Council.

C. Chairpersons Workshop: Site, cost and a preliminary agenda have been determined for the Chairpersons Workshop, and sent to the provosts for distribution to the Department Chairs.

D. Periodic Review: The proposed Periodic Review Policy is scheduled for the BOR Educational Policy Committee on May 21, and for Regents action in July. In response to a question regarding timing for submission of Institutional policies and procedures, Dr. Marx suggested those probably would be due sometime in Spring, 1997.

E. Shared Governance: The May 2, 1996 draft of the Proposed Policy on Shared Governance has been considered by AAAC and will be considered in Chancellor's Council in June. It will not be scheduled for Regents consideration until next Fall.

F. Time to Degree: Committee members expressed several concerns regarding the adequacy of factors considered, and the suggested "policy directions" contained in a "Preliminary Report on Time to Degree" scheduled for presentation as an Information Item for the May 21, 1996 BOR Educational Policy Committee meeting. Dr. Marx said the Legislature was concerned about extending the bachelors degree past 120 hours, and had charged MHEC with reporting on the issue. He also said that defining the problem solely in terms of number of hours was too simple, and that this document was an attempt to establish a broader framework for MHEC discussion prior to becoming a legislative action item.

Among the expressed concerns were the following:

- As policies, such as requiring 15 credits for financial aid, are established to decrease the time to degree, the impact is to decrease access to students. -- The list of factors leading to the longer time to degree omits the impact of the likely loss of transfer hours when the new MHEC General Education policy is fully implemented.
- Since time to degree is also one of the Vision III productivity indicators, and since it now is undecided how to deal with this, it may be desirable to hold time to degree in abeyance as a productivity indicator. Dr. Marx replied that, since benchmarks haven't even been established yet, implementation of the productivity indicators is a ways off, and hopefully policy direction will be set by the time we are ready to implement the productivity indicators.
- As the number of part time students increases, it becomes increasingly worrisome that time to degree is used as a productivity indicator. Dr. Marx replied that it might be appropriate to use two separate time-to-degree indices for part-time and full-time students.
- Either UMS should include national trend data in its study, or suggest to MHEC that it do so.
- There is nothing in the report addressing remedial course work as a factor in increasing time to degree.

G. Workload Report: Dr. Marx distributed and briefly discussed a memo to Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, identifying three changes in the Faculty Workload data collection form which the Department of Fiscal Services intends to request.

1. As repeatedly requested by faculty and department chairs, contact hours would now be reported, but in a manner that does not omit or modify data included in previous reports.
2. A new line will be added to gather information on the number of faculty who "did not engage in any credit-bearing teaching activity."
3. The line requesting data for the coming year will be deleted since the teaching standards are in place for 1995-96.

According to Dr. Marx, DFS denied a UMSA request that those on sabbatical and those with externally-funded-research buy outs of teaching load be excluded from the analysis. However, DFS reportedly intends to "define a new 'adjusted' productivity indicator" which would include buy outs, but not sabbaticals. Buy outs would be classified as "exceptions" and addressed separately in the reporting and analysis of the data. The "adjusted" rate would be used in the summary of the institutional analysis, while the "unadjusted" rate would be included in the complete report. Dr. Marx also suggested a UMSA desire to change the term "exceptions."

The Chancellor reported that North Carolina has adopted the UMS reporting form, and that

Illinois is considering adoption.

III. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (Continued)

A. 1996-97 Council Meeting Sites: The Committee tentatively set the schedule for Fall, 1996 Council meetings: September - UMCP, October - FSU, November - TSU, December - UMBC.

B. The meeting adjourned at 12:09.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
University of Maryland System
Council of University System Faculty
Monday, June 24, 1996
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved As Submitted, August 12, 1996**

Present: Cohen, Chair; Glibert, CEES; Lasher, UMBC; Wallinger, FSU; Chancellor Donald Langenberg, UMSA; George Marx, UMSA; Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA.

Absent: Rebach, UMES

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by the Chair.

I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. Minutes of the May 20, 1996 meeting were amended to list Langdon instead of Luchsinger as the CUSF representative to retirement-incentives task orce, and were approved as amended.

B. Council Procedures: The Committee briefly discussed several procedural options for improving efficiency and quality of consideration of motions during Council meetings, including the following:

1. Prohibiting amendments to main motions until after a set period of time. While the intent is good, reservations were registered that such a procedure violated Robert's Rules of Order, and that the only legitimate way to implement that suggestion was to move to committee of the whole.
2. Enforcing provisions of Robert's Rules of Order, whereby Committee-Reports activity is restricted to reports, and any action motions are considered under the New Business portion of the agenda. This would allow discussion of the issues, but no amendments or action on a main motion till later in the meeting, thus encouraging further reflection and possible committee action during the lunch period.

3. Enforcing/imposing a requirement that all action proposals be distributed in writing prior to the meeting.

C. Discussion Items for Meeting With Chancellor: The Committee identified several potential issues to raise in discussion with the Chancellor, including:

- MHEC statewide plan for post-secondary education
- MHEC report on remedial education
- UMSA salary study
- Distance education
- Domestic Partners
- Progress of the Periodic Review proposal
- UMSA faculty contracts
- Retirement Incentives task force
- Department Chairs Workshop.

II. MEETING WITH CHANCELLOR

A. UDC: The Chair suggested that, in light of current difficulties at UDC, the previous suggestion of investigating in-state tuition for DC students would best be put on hold. Instead, the Chair suggested the Chancellor make a public statement supporting continuation of a public land grant institution. The Chancellor said he would need to investigate the issue more thoroughly before making such a statement.

B. Distance Learning : In response to a question of upcoming issues CUSF ought to be aware of regarding distance learning, the Chancellor noted that "it is out there and growing," and referred to UMUC's 3300 enrollment in courses offered via the TICO system and the research on asynchronous video as examples. In response to a question of adherence to MHEC rules regarding on-campus courses, Dr. Marx said that MHEC is considering abandoning a separate category for distance-learning courses, and simply defining distance learning as a delivery system. The Chancellor suggested the rule requiring half of the courses be taught "on campus" has little to do with what's happening, and that if the rule becomes a problem, the appropriate solution is to change the rule.

Other issues noted by the Chancellor and Dr. Giles-Gee included:

- Appropriateness of focus on copyrights, vs. patents in an MHEC, AAAC subcommittee report proposing a principle that each institution/system establish a policy defining distance-education course materials as the intellectual property of the creator.
- Approval reciprocity across accrediting-agency regions.
- Credentialing student learning in distance-learning courses with no faculty.

C. Statewide Plan for Higher Education: It was noted that MHEC consideration of a statewide plan for higher education seems to be on a fast track. Dr. Giles-Gee called attention to some particularly important questions for faculty, such as reward structures and credit acceptance. It was decided that the Chair should inform faculty of the correct Web address for locating the document/questionnaire (<http://ube.ubalt.edu/www/mhec/theplan.html>), and MHEC's request for

faculty response. It also was decided that the Chair should write to MHEC, identifying specific issues which need further MHEC consideration and examination by faculty groups.

D. Domestic Partners: In response to a question regarding likely BoR action on the Domestic Partners proposal, the Chancellor said the vote is likely to be close, but declined to speculate further.

E. Assessment of CUSF and Suggestions for Future Attention: In response to a question from the Chair, the Chancellor said he thought CUSF was functioning very well, and identified several issues of potential/continued CUSF attention, including:

- A complex of issues related to faculty accountability, such as faculty workload policy and comprehensive review policies. The Chancellor suggested that both of these policies should put UMS in a good position to deal with the tenure issue which eventually will be raised in Maryland.
- Part-time and non-tenure-track positions, as they relate to the academic-freedom dimensions of tenure.
- Ways in which CUSF can help faculty prepare to make the transition to distance learning, with full knowledge of both its virtues and faults.

Dr. Marx added that it was "of credit to CUSF" that there had been an avoidance of an air of contentiousness while participating in the development of the workload policy, the comprehensive review policy, and the forthcoming shared governance policy.

F. Periodic Review: It was reported that the BoR Ed. Policy Committee may act on the Comprehensive Review proposal immediately prior to the August Board meeting, thereby permitting August Board action.

G. Regents' Awards: Dr. Giles-Gee reported that the Regent's Faculty Awards would not be implemented until Spring, 1997, thereby allowing refinement and coordination of the two committee proposals for criteria and procedures.

H. Department Chairs Workshop: Dr. Giles-Gee reported that, to date, approximately 110 have registered for the October 25 workshop, to be held at UMUC.

I. UMS Faculty Contracts: Dr. Giles-Gee reported that the CUSF representative, Ira Block, brought CUSF concerns to the task force studying the issue, and that a "middle-ground" revision had been implemented, but that it was necessary to read the new version to fully understand the nature and impact of the language changes. The proposed new contract will go to the campuses for comment in September, so there should be an opportunity for CUSF consideration in Fall, '96.

J. Early Retirement: Dr. Marx reported that the task force was awaiting actuarial data on likely costs. At this time, it appears approximately 150 UMS employees would be eligible under the same provisions as contained in SB1, as approved by the 1996 Legislature. The questions now are whether the Legislature would approve more than a 60% return of positions, whether or not UMS should submit an early retirement bill, and, if so, whether it should include faculty or only "other" employees. Dr. Marx also reported that the committee "carefully avoided anything that

smacks of faculty entitlement," and that the package will be designed as a management tool rather than as a faculty benefit.

III. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (Continued)

A. August Executive Committee Meeting: The Committee tentatively set 1:00 P.M., Monday August 12 for the transition meeting of the Executive Committee.

B. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 12:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
Council of the University of Maryland System
Monday, August 12, 1996
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved as submitted, September 30, 1996**

Present: Alexander, Chair; Cohen, Outgoing Chair; Glibert, CEES; Lasher, UMBC; Somers, TSU; Wallinger, FSU; Chancellor Donald Langenberg, UMSA; George Marx, UMSA; Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA.

Absent: Rebach, UMES;

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by the Outgoing Chair.

I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. Minutes of the June 24, 1996 meeting were approved as submitted.

II. MEETING WITH CHANCELLOR REGARDING 1995-96 COUNCIL ISSUES

A. UMUC Issues: The Chair (Cohen) circulated correspondence from a UMUC faculty member, indicating that his contract was being terminated, ostensibly because the Director position he occupies is being eliminated. The Chair suggested that, given the high demand for the program in question and UMUC administrative praise for the individual's teaching performance, there is the appearance of a connection between the person's efforts to achieve faculty status for UMUC teaching personnel and being fired.

Dr. Marx suggested that the termination of the Director position was not necessarily connected to the individual's faculty advocacy activities, and that the matter of reinstating the position of Lecturer at UMUC might be pursuable.

The Chair responded that one thing was very clear: the current UMUC contract still identifies the division directors as administrators who serve at the pleasure of the president, and thus does not meet MHEC requirements for faculty contracts. The Chair also noted that he had hoped that a compromise had been reached which would have resolved the issue internally, but this action makes it seem less likely that the compromise has been accepted by UMUC. It may, then, be necessary to raise the issue with the Board of Regents, in accordance with a motion of MHEC.

B. Shared Governance: The Chair expressed surprise to see Shared Governance as an agenda item for the Chancellor's Council. The Chancellor responded that it was placed there to allow last minute second thoughts from the campuses.

C. UMES President Selection Process: The Chair relayed the concern from the UMES faculty assembly regarding the absence of UMES faculty and student participation in the selection process. The Chair also expressed his concern that the Faculty Advisor and Staff Advisor to the Board had been excluded from the BOR session where candidates were considered. Dr. Marx responded that faculty and student representatives were, indeed, included in the UMES selection committee, and that the BoR had honored a request from one of the candidates that "only full regular members of the Board" be included in BoR discussions. The Chancellor said that he did not understand why the two advisors were excluded.

D. Dr. Cohen relinquished the Chair to the 1996-97 CUSF Chair, Dr. Alexander.

III. MEETING WITH THE CHANCELLOR REGARDING 1996-97 ISSUES

A. Board of Regents Meeting: The agenda for the August 23 BoR meeting was distributed and briefly discussed.

B. MHEC Statewide Plan for Higher Education: The Chair distributed copies of "Issues and Trends in Maryland Postsecondary Education," which seeks input, by October 15, 1996, to a series of questions preparatory to development of a revised statewide plan for higher education. The Chancellor suggested the final MHEC statewide plan would carry major implications for UMS institutions and encouraged a CUSF response to the series of questions raised in the "Issues and Trends" paper. The Chair identified several queries of particular import for faculty:

- "Should the state adopt policies which address the balance between teaching, research and service for promotion and tenure?"
- "Should Maryland implement statewide competency testing as a requirement for college and university graduation?"
- Several references and questions regarding time-to-degree, including whether "the state should encourage the development of a three-year bachelor's degree."
- Whether the state should "mandate transferability of all courses among all public colleges and universities."

The Chair raised the question of whether CUSF ought to generate a separate response to the document, and, if so, what should be the appropriate procedure for generating such a response. A

variety options were considered, including the following:

- Executive Committee would produce a reaction statement for CUSF to consider at the September 11 meeting.
- Pieces of the document could be assigned to CUSF committees, with committee reactions brought to the October 11 meeting for approval and rapid forwarding to MHEC.
- Move the meeting with the Faculty Senate Chairs/Presidents to late September in order to discuss and react to the document prior to the deadline.
- Simply encourage individual faculty and the campus faculty senates to respond.
- Have CUSF draft a reaction to the UMS response, rather than attempt some procedure for generating an independent CUSF response to the MHEC document.

In light of the time constraints, an absence of an established committee structure for 1996-97, and the probable availability of a draft UMS response in time for consideration at the September 11 Council meeting, it was decided to react to the System response rather than generate an independent response. It also was decided that the timing made an early meeting with the Senate Chairs impractical.

C. Measuring Productivity: The Chair noted the recurring references to productivity in planning documents, raised the issue of generating better measures of productivity, and sought reaction to the possibility of CUSF sponsorship of a Pew Foundation "Roundtable." The Pew Roundtables employ facilitators to guide participants (e.g. faculty, UMSA personnel, key legislators) in systematic "brainstorming" on a topic. While an individual in the group may write a paper on the results, the objective is not to produce a conference report, per se.

Given the nature of the Pew Roundtables, the current status of benchmarks and indices of productivity in Vision III, and the need to refine/add to those measures, Dr. Marx questioned the utility of a Pew Roundtable at this juncture. The Chancellor expressed agreement with the Chair's characterization of the current Vision III benchmarks/indices as measures of activity rather than productivity, said that UMS is arriving at a "first generation" set of indicators necessary for Vision III, and suggested that a Pew Roundtable could be useful for generating a "second generation" set of indicators of productivity.

It was decided to take the question of CUSF sponsorship to the Council.

D. Regent's Faculty Awards: Dr. Giles-Gee noted the lack of closure on the language of the criteria for teaching, research and scholarship. The matter will be referred to the Ad Hoc committees addressing the implementation of the awards.

IV. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. Council Membership: The Chair reviewed the status of updating the membership roster and noted that the official, persistently-updated roster is now on the CUSF Web site.

B. Committee Structure: It was noted that the current committee structure does not strictly conform to the By Laws stipulation of a one-to-one correspondence with BoR committee

structure, and that it may be desirable to change the By Laws. The addition of an Advancement Committee was suggested, but no action was taken. It also was suggested that there is a need for a personnel/human resources committee. It was decided to incorporate personnel-committee activity into the Administrative Affairs Committee, possibly as a subcommittee.

C. Committee Membership: The committee discussed possible chairs and members of the various committees, with the following identified as tentative committee chair nominations:

- Educational Policy: Larry Lasher
- Administrative Affairs: Trudy Somers
- Legislative Affairs: Ira Block
- Faculty Development: Charles Sternheim

It also was decided to seek specific members to "volunteer" for selected committees as well as invite volunteers for committees at the September Council meeting.

D. Meeting Schedules:

1. Council meetings for Fall, '96 were confirmed:

- September 11 -- UMCP
- October 11 -- FSU
- November 11 -- TSU
- December 10 -- UMBC

2. Council meetings for Spring, '97: The Chair will solicit volunteer hosts during the September Council meeting.

3. Executive Committee will meet the last Monday of each month, with the December date to be decided later.

E. Regents Meeting: The committee briefly discussed items for the Chair to address in his report to the August 22 BoR meeting. Possibilities included a general theme of collaboration, faculty awards, salary, early retirement, adjunct/contractual employees, and shared governance.

F. Early Retirement: The Chair reported the following features of the "current" (as of 8/12/96) direction of discussions in the Early-Retirement Task Force.

- The eligibility age may be changed from 50 to 60.
- Supposedly, there is some legislative support for returning 100% of the money and positions to the institutions.
- There is legislative opposition to part-time "rehires" of retirees.
- Those in TIAA-CREF will likely be excluded from the bill.

The Chair reported that he would take the position in task force deliberations that there should be maximum flexibility, consistent with institutional well being.

G. Materials Distribution: The committee identified the following possibilities for dissemination prior to, or during, the September Council meeting:

- Minutes of Previous CUSF and Executive Committee meetings
- Minutes of the June, '96 BoR Educational Policy Committee meeting

- Chancellor's Annual Report to the Regents
- CUSF Faculty Development Committee survey report
- MHEC "Issues and Trends" document
- CUSF Constitution and By Laws
- UMS organizational chart
- Current CUSF roster
- Past Chair's Report
- Chair's Report/ Executive Committee Report

H. CUSF Agenda: The following were identified for possible inclusion in the September CUSF agenda:

- MHEC Statewide Plan for Higher Education
- Presentation by representative from Institute for Distance Education
- A presentation on upcoming legislative activity
- Adjunct/ contractual employees
- Agenda procedures/practices to encourage efficiency and deliberation
- Committee structure and membership

I. The meeting adjourned at 4:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
Council of the University of Maryland System
Monday, September 30, 1996
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved as submitted, October 28, 1996**

Present: Alexander, Chair; Cohen, UMCP; Lasher, UMBC; Rebach, UMES; Somers, TSU; Wallinger, FSU; Chancellor Donald Langenberg, UMSA; George Marx, UMSA; Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA; Gertrude Eaton, UMSA.

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m.

I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. Minutes of the August 12, 1996 meeting were approved as submitted.

B. MHEC "Trends" Response:

1. Procedural Matters: Ad Hoc Committee Chair Lasher reviewed the committee membership and procedures for drafting a CUSF response. Committee members are: Lasher,

UMBC, Chair; Somers, TSU; Gill, UMBC; Davis, UMCP; and Arthur, CSC. After meeting to compile and discuss individually drafted sections, Committee Chair Lasher produced a lengthy draft document for Executive Committee examination. It was noted that, except for a few items, the draft coverage of issues was consistent with a preliminary UMSA response. At a later point, it was noted that MHEC is likely to ignore responses which do not directly address the questions posed in the "Trends" document.

The Chair said he would use today's discussions and decisions as a guide to his participation in the MHEC Faculty Advisory Council discussions of the document.

The Executive Committee discussed procedures for efficient Council consideration and action. It was decided to:

- Focus debate on substantive issues, rather than editorial changes in language.
- Present to Council, as background, the lengthy Ad Hoc Committee draft, and also a cover sheet identifying the principles of the response. Council would then focus debate, and take action on, the "principles" document.
- Recommend to Council that the final CUSF response be sent directly to MHEC, with a copy to UMS.
- Structure the final CUSF response into two tiers: those most central to faculty concerns and other important-but-less-central concerns.

2. Review of Ad Hoc Committee Draft: In general, the Executive Committee approved the tone and content of the draft response. Gertrude Eaton said that, with the exception of the section on "Remediation," the draft CUSF response is consistent with the positions taken by UMS and individual institutions. During review of specific points, members suggested the following, among others:

- Revise the section on "Moderating Tuition Increases" to reduce the possible interpretation that CUSF is supporting tuition caps.
- Caution in recommending more stringent policies than already exist for scholarships and for out-of-state tuition, and the addition of qualifiers to allow institutional flexibility to meet the competition for Maryland students from nearby out-of-state institutions.
- In light of the impact on access, significant differences between the needs of "traditional" and "non-traditional" students, ambiguity in definitions of "remediation," and the needs of individual students, caution in recommending policies which suggest remediation is solely the mission of the community colleges.

Except for the reservations noted above, the Executive Committee agreed with the draft answers to the MHEC questions. Particular agreement was expressed regarding the positions taken on questions addressing:

- The need for stable and predictable state funding.
- Common general education requirements.
- Teacher training.
- Balance among teaching, research and service.
- Use of part-time faculty.
- Time to degree / Incentives to students for finishing earlier. It was suggested that the distinction

between time-to-degree and credits-to-degree be emphasized.

-- Competency testing.

-- Transferability of courses.

C. Committee Appointments: It was decided to nominate Joel Cohen, UMCP, as chair of the Nominations Committee.

Based on expressed interest and on the need to properly staff the various committees, it was decided to make the following committee appointments:

-- ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: Trudy Somers, TSU, Chair; Larry Goldman, UMAB; Marci McClive, FSU; Lois Vietri, UMCP.

-- EDUCATIONAL POLICY: Larry Lasher, UMBC, Chair; Bill Chapin, UMES; Christopher Davis, UMCP; Derek Gill, UMBC; Martha Siegel, TSU; Ira Block, UMCP.

-- FACULTY DEVELOPMENT: Charles Sternheim, UMCP, Chair; Alcott Arthur, CSC; Pat Glibert, CEES; Lucille Strain, BSU; Habiba Deming, FSU; Sanjay Ramchander, CSC.

-- NOMINATIONS: Joel Cohen, UMCP, Chair; Vince Luchsinger, UB.

-- LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS: Ira Block, UMCP, Chair; Steve Rebach, UMES.

II. MEETING WITH THE CHANCELLOR

A. MHEC "Trends" Response: The Chancellor noted that UMS intends to submit a response to the specific questions asked, but also take note of other concerns not specifically addressed, or inadequately addressed in the MHEC document. It also was noted that the CUSF draft response may not be consistent with the institutional and UMS responses regarding technology and distance education.

B. Distance Education: In light of an expressed desire for CUSF to become involved in major issues prior to the drafting of UMS documents, and in light of a September 23, 1996 memorandum from George Marx regarding a need for UMS recommendations on distance education, the Chair proposed charging the Educational Policy Committee and the Faculty Development Committee to jointly study the question of distance education, and submit a report prior to the March Council meeting. The Chair noted several documents and studies he is aware of, which will be forwarded to the study committee. The Executive Committee concurred with the charge.

C. Contractual and Non-Tenure-Track Employees: The Chair proposed charging the Administrative Affairs Committee to study, and report to Council prior to the April meeting, on the status and role of contractual and non-tenure-track faculty, and on the proper balance between their roles and the roles of tenure-track faculty. The Chancellor raised the question of inclusion of post-doctoral students, and others noted the confounding factor of special circumstances at UMAB. The Committee concurred in the charge.

D. Alternatives to Faculty Salaries: The Chair referred the committee to a request from Vice Chancellor Marx that CUSF study and report on faculty reaction to the possibility of

alternative means (e.g. fringe benefits, travel support, staff support) of achieving the goal of salaries at the 85th percentile of norm groups. It was decided to charge the Faculty Development Committee to conduct such a study and report to Council at the February meeting.

E. Faculty Collaboration: Dr. Marx noted a desire by Regent Finan to encouraging faculty participation in inter-institutional collaborative efforts, a concern which goes beyond the realm of teaching. It was decided to charge the Faculty Development Committee to study ways of encouraging such collaborative activity, and report to Council.

F. CUSF Resolution on Faculty Salaries: Pursuant to a September CUSF resolution which had been engendered by a "Blue Paper" on "Enhancing the Flagship" and an accompanying cover letter from Regent Billingsly, the Chair reminded the Chancellor of correspondence on the matter and asked for a response.

The Chancellor noted that this Blue Paper was the first of an intended "ten-or-so topics" to be addressed. He said this Blue Paper was intended to describe what had happened regarding enhancements at the Flagship, and followed upon a two-year development of the Vision III budget plan which addressed all known and likely imminent factors, including the 1988-mandated enhancements. According to the Chancellor, coming out of those discussions "arose the thought" that, at this time, "we might succeed with a targeted, focused attempt to go beyond the Vision III plan for one purpose, and one purpose only:" addressing the gap between faculty salaries and the 85th percentile, and "achieving national eminence." He suggested, for better or worse, the quickest and best way to do that was through eliminating the gap at the two largest research institutions, UMCP and UMAB.

Upon request for clarification, the Chancellor reiterated the intent that this was the first of a series of attempts to eliminate the gap at all the campuses. When asked whether the decision had gone through the Presidents Council, the Chancellor replied that it had "gone through the head of the Chairman of the Board of Regents," and that subsequent to the decision, it was first communicated to Presidents Kirwan and Ramsey, and to some extent to UMBC. The reaction by the other presidents was "Where's mine?" To which the answer was: "If it ever comes, in later years." At a later point, the Chancellor said that, while the initiative had not gone through the usual procedure of system approval in open session, it had been discussed with a number of individual regents. The Vice Chancellor added that, while the Regents had not approved this particular package of components, they had approved all components in the proposal.

Vice Chancellor Marx said that part of the strategy was the belief that, if additional faculty-salary funds beyond those in the four-year plan were to be achieved, the greatest chance to do so was by targeting College Park for recruiting and retention of outstanding faculty. He said there was a belief that, once there was a commitment to that goal, the chance of getting it for other institutions is much more likely. Upon request for clarification, the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor reiterated the point that it is "targeted for retention and recruitment," and noted that the 85th-percentile goal is calculated as average faculty salary across the institution, and that, hypothetically, the whole \$5 million could be spent on one faculty member.

It was noted that Council concern was focused on an impression of the initiative that the "haves get more, while the have-nots get less," while the goal ought to be to improve the salaries of all faculty in the system. It also was noted that the problem of faculty salaries goes beyond retention and recruitment, and that this initiative would do nothing to change very low faculty morale if it is solely targeted toward retention and recruitment. In response, the Chancellor said that was a "clear statement of reality," and that another "reality" was greater likelihood that legislators would approve funds to retain the best faculty than for an across-the-board raise. The Chancellor also noted that every one of the regents "believe" in the need to improve faculty salaries, by any means necessary, and that this held potential for a major "overnight" improvement in UMCP's national stature.

The Chair noted that the more the initiative is discussed, the more issues are raised, and suggested the most appropriate approach for further discussion was to have Dr. Marx address the whole Council, rather than continued explanation addressed to Executive Committee.

G. Shared Governance: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed copies of the final draft of the proposed policy on Shared Governance, and noted that it is scheduled for Regents action at the October meeting.

H. Regents Faculty Awards: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed copies of the final draft of the Board of Regents Faculty Awards, and noted that all that is left is designation of a regent to serve on the committee and coordination with the CUSF Faculty Development Committee for implementation.

III. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (continued)

A. Agenda for October 11 Council Meeting: The committee confirmed the previously submitted agenda for the October Council meeting. In addition to the usual reports, it includes a discussion with Regent Finan, the UMAB motion on alternate members and discussion of the MHEC document.

B. Senate/Forum Chairs Meeting: The committee briefly discussed possible dates, formats and agendas for the meeting with the campus Senate/Forum Chairs. Distance Education was suggested as a possible topic, and it was decided that the Chair would distribute a list of possible dates and sites for committee reaction.

C. Discussion Items for Regent Finan's Visit: In response to Regent Finan's request that we supply a list of topics we would like to discuss during his visit at the October meeting, the following were selected: Faculty Participation in Collaborative Efforts. Accountability and Productivity.

Faculty Salaries.

D. Telecommunication Council: The Chair suggested charging the Nominations Committee with identifying and appointing members to the Telecommunication Council of the

University of Maryland Academic Telecommunication System. The committee concurred.

E. CUSF Meeting Hosts: The Chair noted that there had been only campus (UMAB) volunteer to host a Spring Semester Council Meeting. The committee suggested soliciting invitations from the campuses.

F. Faculty Salaries Resolution: The committee briefly discussed the matter of continued discussion of the Blue Paper proposal and the Chancellor's response to the CUSF Resolution. One suggestion was for the Executive Committee to take a position on the issue, and present it to Council. Another suggestion was to seek a written commitment from the Regents, identifying the plan by which they intend to improve salaries. No action was taken.

G. The meeting adjourned at 4:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
Council of the University of Maryland System Faculty
Monday, October 28, 1996
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved, as Amended, November 25, 1996**

Present: Alexander, Chair; Cohen, UMCP; Lasher, UMBC; Rebach, UMES; Somers, TSU; Wallinger, FSU; Chancellor Donald Langenberg, UMSA; George Marx, UMSA; Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. Minutes of the September 30, 1996 meeting were approved as submitted.

B. Exempt Employees: The Chair circulated a copy of a letter regarding benefits for exempt employees and asked for guidance on distribution. It was decided to refer the letter to the Administrative Affairs committee for examination as part of the charge to examine the status of contractual faculty.

C. Support for CUSF: It was called to the attention of the Committee that there may be misunderstandings of the oral agreement reached in Chancellor's Council regarding the levels of UMS and institutional support for CUSF Executive Committee release time. It was decided to raise the issue of a long-term policy, as well as the question of current levels of support with the Chancellor, and impress upon him the need to have a written policy in place.

D. Reapportionment: In light of a UMAB self-conducted tally of faculty and a consequent request for an additional CUSF representative, and in light of the By-Laws stipulation of 1996 as the appropriate year for reapportionment, it was decided to raise the issue with Dr. Marx, and seek official UMSA data to confirm the UMAB count.

E. Senate/Forum Chairs Meeting: Following a discussion of alternative dates and sites, December 7, 1996 was selected as a tentative date, pending availability of the Chancellor. No decision was made regarding the site.

F. UMUC Faculty: It was decided to seek an update from the Chancellor regarding the number of faculty, the policy on UMUC faculty contracts, and representation on CUSF.

G. MHEC Issues and Trends Response: Following a brief discussion, it was decided to seek an update from the Chancellor on UMS response and the extent of consistency with the CUSF response.

H. November CUSF Meeting Agenda: In addition to the usual reports, the following were listed as items for the November 11 Council meeting: Joann Argersinger presentation on K-16 Motion on By-Laws Amendment regarding alternate members.

I. December/January Executive Committee Meeting: Monday, December 16 was set as the tentative date.

II. MEETING WITH THE CHANCELLOR

A. Support for CUSF: In response to a request from the Chair that UMSA supply a written statement on the agreement for support for 1996-97 Executive Committee release time, Dr. Marx reviewed the history of the agreement, and indicated that individuals and/or institutions need to supply an account number in order to accomplish the transfer of funds.

In response to a question regarding the long term policy, Dr. Marx said that a draft proposal had been sent to Chancellor's Council, but that there were several problems with it: It had been drafted as a BOR policy, had not been cleared through CUSS, and included a provision for release time for all CUSF members. In order to move forward efficiently, the Chancellor suggested a conference of the CUSS and CUSF Chairs and Dr. Marx to resolve the issues. Dr. Marx indicated he would arrange such a meeting.

B. Reapportionment: Following examination of the CUSF By-Laws and the official UMSA records of campus faculty numbers by the Nominations and Membership Committee Chair, it was determined that reapportionment of membership was to occur in August, 1996, on the basis of 1995 official data. In that light, it was determined that no changes in the current apportionment of membership is warranted at this time. The Nominations Committee will present a full report to Council.

C. Senate/Forum Chairs Meeting: Following consultation with the Chancellor, December 7 was confirmed as the date for the meeting. The site was not specified, pending further investigation of several options.

D. MHEC Trends and Issues Responses: Upon request from the Chair, Vice-Chancellor Marx provided an update on the UMS response to the MHEC Trends and Issues document. Dr. Marx distributed a draft of the UMS response, said the Regents have had an opportunity for input, and that it will go to Chancellor's Council for final review and to individual Regents before being sent to MHEC. The UMS response will be distributed to CUSF at the November meeting.

E. Other: There was a brief discussion of the Governor's Higher Education Summit, scheduled for November 19. The CUSF Chair has been invited and the UMS presidents and a member of each board of visitors are expected to attend, as well as governors of some surrounding states. Expectations may be to foster closer links between the Maryland business and higher education communities.

F. UMUC Faculty: The Committee sought clarification of the inconsistent manner in which UMUC counts faculty, noting that the official UMS count for 1995 is ten, while UMUC supplied a number of 46 to MHEC last year. It was noted that, if faculty are defined as individuals with faculty contracts, none of the individuals at UMUC are "faculty" since none of them are operating with contracts by which they are hired for at least one academic year. Instead, the individuals are listed as administrators, with contracts stipulating that they serve at the pleasure of the president. The response was that the seeming inconsistency is a result of meeting different reporting criteria.

The Chair and Committee suggested the "floating target" data have significant policy implications. For example, compliance with the BOR-approved Shared Governance Policy raises questions of whether there is a faculty, who are the faculty, and whether there is faculty-selected body of faculty representatives for input to UMUC policies. In response to the Chair's request for a productive way of proceeding, Dr. Marx said that each institution must, by May 15, 1997, submit a report demonstrating compliance with the Shared Governance Policy. It also was agreed that specific, written definitions need to be obtained in order to compare the UMS and MHEC reporting criteria.

While recognizing the extreme sensitivity of discussing UMUC personnel decisions, concern was expressed about UMUC faculty representation in CUSF. It was noted that questions are raised when the individuals who pursue faculty representation in CUSF and other representative faculty bodies are fired. The Chancellor said that, following the August Executive Committee discussion of the issue, he had talked to Dr. Massey, indicating that the CUSF Chair would contact him. The Chair responded that he was unaware that he was expected to take the initiative, but that he now would do so. Dr. Marx suggested the focus of that meeting ought to be the way in which UMUC plans to comply with the Shared Governance policy. Committee members suggested a central concern was the question of representation on CUSF. The Chair said he would seek input and guidance from the Executive Committee regarding the content and focus of the meeting.

G. Presidents Council/Chancellor's Council Agendas: There was brief discussion of several items listed on the agendas, including the following:

--Formula Funding: In response to requests from some legislators, Frank Komenda will address the question of moving to formula funding for higher education. Two crucial questions, among others, concern the base of the formula and the impact on institutional budget flexibility and priorities.

--TIAA-CREF/State Retirement Contribution Disparity: It was noted that, due to the high cost, a proposal for changes in "spousal benefits" for TIAA-CREF retirees will not be introduced in the legislature this year.

--Productivity Benchmarks: Institutional Vision III benchmarks and MHEC Accountability-Report Benchmarks are listed as an action item. They will next go to the BOR Educational Policy Committee for approval. Dr. Marx agreed to include these items in his report to the November CUSF meeting.

--Report of the Task Force on Minorities in the Life Sciences: Dr. Marx said this item referred to a draft task force report of recommendations on steps UMS should take to encourage an increase in minority registration in the life sciences.

A question was raised regarding the impact of a new policy of reporting SAT scores whereby "exempt" groups would no longer be excluded. Dr. Marx said that exempt students were always included and that, in the past, the only groups to be excluded in large numbers were foreign students, for whom the verbal score was excluded. Dr. Marx also noted that, in the past, scores were excluded for continuing-education students, if only an ACT score was reported, or if a student had both ACT and SAT scores and was admitted on the basis of the ACT. In response to an inquiry about the results of an audit of SAT-score reporting, Dr. Marx said the reporting discrepancies ranged from 2% to 25% of the selected sample, and that each of the exceptions of not reporting stemmed from legitimate differences of interpretation and different practices that had, at some point in time, been sanctioned. He added that it was fair to say there had not been any rampant manipulation of data.

The Chancellor and Dr. Marx said that under the new policy, for all first-time, full-time freshmen, if an SAT score is reported, the student is included, and that one Regent said that if we are going to err, we should err on the side of integrity. The Chancellor commented that a phenomenon of all data reporting depends on the definitional parameters of the requestor, and that different requests for data reporting frequently use different definitions.

H. Department Chairs Conference: In response to a request for assessment of the conference, Dr. Giles Gee said it was too early to tell, since there had been inadequate time to examine the evaluations. However, attendance was good, especially at the opening session and by new chairs. There also was anecdotal data that several of the small workshops (e.g. workload reporting, periodic review) were quite informative and that the keynote address was well received.

Disappointment was expressed that only half those attending stayed for Dr. Florestano's address.

I. The meeting adjourned at 1:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
Council of the University of Maryland System
Monday, November 25, 1996
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved as Submitted, December 16, 1996**

Present: Alexander, Chair; Cohen, UMCP; Lasher, UMBC; Rebach, UMES; Somers, TSU; Wallinger, FSU; George Marx, UMSA; Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. Minutes of the October 28, 1996 meeting were approved, as amended to note that reapportionment data (II, B) was determined for all member institutions, with no changes warranted.

B. Senate/Forum Chairs Meeting: The location of the meeting with the Senate/Forum Chairs will be the 7th floor of the Library at UMBC. Mailings will go out November 25.

C. Issues to Discuss With Vice-Chancellor Marx: The Chair and committee identified topics for discussion with Dr. Marx, including:

- Clarification of impact of revisions in the BOR sick leave policy, as previously distributed to Executive Committee.
- Identification and exploration of the issues surrounding distance education, and their impact on faculty.
- Level of support for collaborative faculty development grants.

D. Distance Education Symposium: Councilor Lasher is serving on a committee planning a Chancellor's Symposium on Policy and Distance Education, scheduled for March, 1997. Among the tentative symposium agenda items is one dealing with identifying "constraints to, and enablers for, faculty in developing courses in distance learning." It was noted that the clear intent is to produce action steps. It was decided to make a report on the issue an agenda item for the December Council meeting.

E. Other Concerns: Council briefly discussed other concerns, including:

1. The Chair noted that he had received correspondence and information from UMCP faculty expressing concern regarding the new immigration bill, and the implications of new resident-aliens reporting/verification requirements imposed on colleges and universities. There is a possibility the Chair of the Legislative Affairs Committee will report on it at the December CUSF meeting.

2. Concern was expressed concerning the continued absence of a written policy governing release-time support for CUSF and CUSS Executive Committee members. The Chair said he was waiting on Dr. Marx to arrange the meeting necessary to revive action on the issue.

3. Concern was expressed about disruptive conversations among councilors during CUSF meetings. The point was made that it is both disconcerting and sometimes difficult to attend to the speaker who has the floor at the moment.

F. Conference With UMUC President: The Chair sought input regarding the scope, content and objectives of a conference to be held regarding the status of faculty at UMUC. Comments from Executive Committee members included the following, among others:

- It was suggested that there are three separate, but related issues: How do we generally define faculty in order to have consistency across UMS and to impact fair treatment of faculty? How do we determine membership in CUSF? Should we become involved in individual cases of dismissal?
- It was suggested the primary concern is the floating definition of faculty. In order to achieve uniformity, and in order to determine CUSF membership, there needs to be one definition, preferably one officially adopted by BOR.
- Another view was that, given the choices available, the MHEC definition is preferable because it is sufficiently detailed to define faculty rights, since it specifies one-year contracts and not serving at the will of the president.
- The view was expressed that a specific case of injustice was a "battle that ought to be fought."
- It was noted that the BOR-approved Shared Governance Policy stipulates a date certain for demonstrating compliance/implementation.
- A question was raised whether there is any point in revisiting the basic question about full-time, tenure track faculty at UMUC. One view was that further discussion with Dr. Massey and others might more profitably focus on issues of governance, representation to CUSF, and the treatment of terminated members of the UMUC staff who had been representatives to CUSF.

The Chair concluded the discussion with the comment that he needed to do more investigation and data gathering (e.g. specifics of the different definitions of faculty, current conditions at UMUC) prior to a scheduled conference with President Massey.

G. Meeting Agendas:

1. Council: The Chair confirmed acceptability of Regent Ed Crawford as a guest speaker at the February 17, 1997 CUSF meeting.

2. Senate/Forum Chairs: The agenda for the December 7, 1996 meeting includes a general discussion of distance education, a presentation on the coming legislative session with Frank Komenda, and an open session with the Chancellor. To date, no additional topic suggestions have come from the participants.

II. MEETING WITH THE VICE CHANCELLOR

A. Faculty Development Awards: The Chair sought and received confirmation that the Faculty Development Awards would be funded at the same level as last year. In light of Regent Finan's expressed desire to increase collaborative faculty projects, the question was asked whether there was potential to increase this award fund. Dr. Marx replied that there was no chance of an increase as long as it was funded from the Chancellor's discretionary account, and that a significant increase would need to be built into the operating budget. When asked what the first step was to do so, Dr. Marx said, in light of last year's legislative deletion of a \$100,000 System-budget request, tactically, it would need to be incorporated in institutional budgets. The Chair said he would discuss the issue with selected regents, including Regent Finan and Regent Crawford.

B. Accident Leave and Sick Leave Policy for Faculty: Dr. Giles-Gee noted that the proposed new policy was developed in response to revised federal laws and to the need to resolve the bifurcation of policies for faculty and other employees. Dr. Marx said the major change was a reduction from full, to two thirds compensation, since accident leave is not taxable. The Chair suggested circulating the proposed policy to the members for comment, and if there are a number of comments, referring it to the Administrative Affairs Committee.

C. Definitions of "Faculty:" Dr. Giles-Gee responded to an inquiry regarding the existence of a UMS definition of faculty by distinguishing between the IPED classifications, which conform to a federal reporting system, and the BOR definition, which entails a general definition plus titles for different types of faculty. There was speculation regarding an explanation of why there would be a significant discrepancy between UMSA and UMAB counts of fulltime faculty, but no authoritative explanation is available, without detailed information.

D. Distance Education: The Education Policy Committee Chair noted several reports and upcoming events where the focus is on distance education, and sought identification/clarification of issues to be addressed under four subtopics: Faculty Reward System, Faculty Productivity, Faculty Development, and Faculty Status/Governance. Discussion addressed the following points, among others:

- Dr. Marx suggested that distance education will become an increasingly potent force in how higher education is conducted, and that it is essential that UMS faculty become competent in/comfortable with, that modality. consequently, a question is: What we can do in the reward structure to provide positive incentives to increase faculty participation, in place of a currently negative connotation of it as an inferior method of teaching/learning?
- In faculty workload reporting, exceptions might be appropriate for such factors as course development or significantly larger class size.
- Faculty assessment is a major issue, especially since student evaluations of faculty typically go

down for the first few semesters of teaching in the distance-education mode.

- If the material is video taped, is the faculty member entitled to residual rights?
- Given the need for training in teaching via the distance technologies and in incorporating distance-ed technologies in current courses, should faculty be hired specifically to teach those course and/or should current faculty be integrated into distance education?
- Given the enormous library of existent "canned" courses and materials, how does one maintain necessary student-faculty interaction?
- Conference discussions might address the distinction between distance education as one model, versus the only model or the dominant model.
- There are multiple models of distance education, ranging from two-site interactive approaches, to courses offered on the Internet.
- There will need to be a significant reallocation of funds to do an adequate job of retraining faculty. In this light, there may need to be some kind of UMS control, rather than simply dumping money on the institutions to spend as they see fit.
- Unlike the business/industry model of rewards for advance training, there seem to be no incentives for faculty, other than learning to manage a class.
- UMUC has the most extensive faculty development program for distance education. A question was raised whether the Institute for Distance Education could be expanded into a system-wide resource.
- Some faculty fear video taping courses will eliminate the need for their positions.
- Multiple issues which are central to the faculty-governance role arise regarding "virtual university" models (e.g. Who certifies courses? Who assures program quality?). It was noted that: Western Governors University seems to be a model for maintaining quality via specification of measurable outcomes; UMS recognizes a course if it was offered and recognized as an equivalent course by an accredited institution; MHEC used to be able to control quality if there was a site inside Maryland. Dr. Marx noted that, on the professional-training level, UMUC offers "virtual university" programs, that some traditional faculty functions such as advising and mentoring do occur, and that students are "very satisfied" with it.

E. Chancellor's Council: Dr. Marx noted that the December 2 Chancellor's Council had been cancelled, but that there would be a Presidents Council meeting, with the following agenda items identified: follow-up on the Higher Education Summit, a time frame for the FY 99 budget, and strategy for the 1997 legislative session,

III. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (continued)

A. Agenda for December 10 Council Meeting: The Committee confirmed a tentative agenda submitted by the Chair. In addition to the usual reports, the following were listed as items for the December 10 Council meeting:-- Nominations/appointments to the Telecommunications Council.

- Faculty Development Committee reports/motions on Faculty Development Awards and UMSA request for reaction to "Benefits Alternatives to Salaries."
- Motion on By-Laws Amendment regarding alternate members.
- Presentations on legislative session and budget by guests Frank Komenda, Associate Vice Chancellor for State Relations, and Joe Vivona, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance.

-- Luncheon guest: Student Regent Kevin Lawrence.

B. Telecommunications Council: The Nominations and Membership Chair noted that additional nominations for the Telecommunications Council are needed to present a full complement to fill available positions.

C. By-Laws Amendment Regarding Alternate Members: The Administrative Affairs Committee Chair briefly reviewed progress of formulating alternative versions of the motion, pursuant to the motion approved at the November 11 CUSF meeting. It was decided to distribute the alternatives to the membership prior to the December meeting.

D. Department Chairs Workshop Evaluations: Copies of the evaluation prepared by Dr. Giles-Gee will be distributed to the membership for comment and response. If responses warrant, continued CUSF sponsorship will be proposed.

The meeting adjourned at 12:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
Council of the University of Maryland System
Monday, December 16, 1996
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved as Submitted, February 24, 1997**

Present: Alexander, Chair; Cohen, UMCP; Lasher, UMBC; Rebach, UMES; Somers, TSU; Wallinger, FSU; Chancellor Langenberg, UMSA; George Marx, UMSA.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. Proposed Reordering of Regents' Priorities: The Chair summarized the discussion and action taken on a Position Paper, "Toward Implementation of the University of Maryland System's Founding Goals," during the December 12 BOR Executive Session. The proposal identifies the "overarching goal" of "achieving and sustaining national eminence" as the most important, and asserts that "the UMS research institutions, primarily University of Maryland College Park and University of Maryland at Baltimore, provide the shortest path to approaching national eminence." The Chair noted that, while no monies are attached to it, the reordering of priorities would affect future distribution of funds.

A number of the Presidents, especially from the comprehensive universities, spoke against

the proposal. Reportedly, they argued, among other things, that it was inappropriate to completely delete undergraduate education from the priorities; that the omission of any reference to some UMS institutions was wrong; and that, if passed, the proposal would undercut the position of some presidents with their faculty. One president, while appreciative of including the HBI's in the priorities, said the HBI's ought to be judged on their own merits, rather than within the context of heavy emphasis on collaborative efforts.

The Chair said the discussion indicated a lack of clarity of purpose of the document. One suggestion was that it was intended come out before the 1997 legislative session and serve as a vehicle to prompt more legislative support for adequate UMS funding. The reported reasoning was that the Legislature will not provide additional funds for undergraduate education, but may do so for achieving the national-eminence goal.

The proposal has been withdrawn and sent to a task force of selected presidents and regents for rewriting. It is due back to the Regents some time in the Spring.

The Chair raised the question of CUSF involvement in rewriting the document, and reported that Regent Billingsly indicated the Chair was welcome to participate if he wanted to spend his time doing so. The general consensus of the Committee was that, as the representative of System faculty, CUSF ought to have a voice in determining the policy. Final decision was deferred until after consulting the Chancellor.

B. Faculty Salary Enhancement: The Chair reported that the previously proposed enhancement of faculty salaries for UMCP had been revised. Reportedly, the Governor will submit a request for two successive \$5 million appropriations for salary enhancement of all UMS institutions, except UMAB. Half of each year's appropriation would be for UMCP, and half would be for the remaining institutions, except UMAB. Half of each year's appropriation would be for UMCP, and half would be for the remaining institutions, except UMAB.

C. Junior Faculty: The Chair introduced a follow-up discussion of a study of the needs and views of junior faculty, as proposed at the Senate/Forum Chairs meeting. At that time, it was suggested that perceived expectations faced by younger, non-tenured faculty are significantly different from those that were faced by faculty who are now at the associate and professor ranks.

As requested, Councilor Somers provided an overview of several concerns and suggestions, including the following:

- The demographics need to be examined very carefully before settling on a definition of junior faculty. Are we talking only about non tenured, tenure-track assistant professors, or should the mentoring concern extend to others?
- We need to question the assumption that the academic career tracks of the future will look like those followed by current senior faculty.
- The best approach to understanding the issues is to gather data from multiple entry points (e.g. from junior faculty, their department chairs, and senior-faculty colleagues).

Committee discussion focused on the preferred data gathering approaches, with some

expressed preference for focus groups, rather than surveys and/or interviews. Councilors suggested that, if focus groups are the chosen data-gathering method, the process needs to start at the institutional level; there ought to be professional facilitators; and there ought to be campus delegates to System-wide focus groups.

D. Shared Governance: The Chair briefly reviewed the Executive Committee's request to be involved in reviewing the campus shared-governance plans, and Vice-Chancellor Marx's response. Agreement was reached that CUSF is not asking for an approval voice, but is seeking inclusion in the review process and input before the Chancellor's final-approval decision is made.

E. UMUC: The Chair sought additional guidance from the Committee regarding the most appropriate approach to be taken in a conference with UMUC President Massey. The Committee suggested the Shared Governance document provides a basis for discussion since it impacts all areas of concern. It also was suggested that the Chair ought to note the perception that participation in CUSF is dangerous to one's continued employment at UMUC.

F. Minutes of the November 25, 1996 meeting approved as submitted.

II. MEETING WITH THE CHANCELLOR

A. Junior Faculty: The Chancellor said, in light of published data that the life of an assistant professor is not like what it used to be, it would be helpful to know more about the lives of UMS junior faculty. In his view, focus groups may be a useful way of gathering such data, but he also would like advice from social science researchers on how best to proceed. In response to the question of defining "junior faculty," the Chancellor suggested including newly tenured individuals, as well as those who are non-tenured, tenure-track faculty. In response to the question of appropriate next steps, Dr. Marx identified individuals from the Cooperative Extension Service who have experience facilitating focus groups, and suggested Councilor Somers meet with them.

B. Shared Governance: Dr. Marx reviewed the intended process for review and approval of the institutional Shared Governance policies. He also characterized the CUSF request for inclusion as a desire to intervene in the process at a point when the president has already signed off, and said he was uneasy with that. The Chair responded that CUSF played a major role in developing the policy and, consequently, is uniquely qualified to identify instances where a president interprets the policy differently than was intended. Dr. Marx suggested it was more appropriate for an institutional faculty senate to voice objections, and that we ought to avoid a regulatory role counter to the governance structure of a particular campus. It was suggested that, on such a basic issue, CUSF ought to have a voice in order to fulfill its role as an advisor to the Chancellor.

The Chancellor said it is an important first step to have the shared governance report prepared and approved by the institutional "shared governance system," and that it is important to assure that there has been a review/certification by all constituent faculty, staff, and student groups. The Chancellor said at the stage of receiving such a report he has no objections to

CUSF review of the plans. He also noted the importance of informing the campuses of the need for involvement of all constituent groups in the development of institutional shared governance plans. It also was noted that the approving bodies need to be elected representatives of the constituent groups, rather than members appointed by the president. It was agreed that a letter from the Chancellor to the presidents, detailing the approval requirements, would also be forwarded to the campus senate/forum chairs as part of the regular CUSF correspondence.

C. Proposed Reordering of Regents' Priorities: The Chair reviewed his interpretation of the discussion of the issue during the Executive Session of the Board of Regents meeting, noted the question of CUSF involvement in the rewriting of the proposal, and sought the Chancellor's reaction. The Chancellor asked to go "off the record" for a response.

Upon going back on record, both the Chancellor and Dr. Marx drew a distinction between the reprioritizing proposal and the Vision III budget plan, and noted that the proposal would reprioritize only the founding goals, and was intended to be "additive" to, not a revision of, Vision III. As such, there is no exclusion of the attention to undergraduate education incorporated in Vision III. In response to a question of the likely future of the position paper, the Chancellor said it already has consumed numerous hours of discussion, and would not simply go away. In response to a question of UMSA involvement in drafting the proposal, the Chancellor said it was limited to accurately relaying the Regents' views.

The Chair reintroduced the question of CUSF participation in the task force charged with revising the priorities position paper, noting that, while his personal agenda is already overloaded, as the only CUSF member not representing a campus, he is the most appropriate person to fill that position. The Chancellor noted that since the task is to set priorities, some will inevitably be dissatisfied, no matter what the final document proposes. The consensus of the Executive Committee was that since CUSF represents a System faculty perspective, the Chair, as the Faculty Advisor to the Regents, ought to accept Regent Billingsly's offer of appointment to the rewriting task force.

D. UMUC Issue: Upon inquiry, The Chancellor said he had talked to UMUC President Massey at the time of the dismissals of two faculty who were CUSF representatives, and found no evidence of a connection between their dismissals and participation in CUSF. A question was asked: How does one remove the impression created by the prima facie evidence that participation in CUSF is hazardous to one's job? The Chancellor replied that the key is the requirement that the UMUC shared governance plan meet all stipulations of the Shared Governance policy, including the requirement of meeting CUSF representation qualifications.

E. Other Concerns and Information Items:

1. Vice-Chancellor George Marx said closure seems to have come on the issue of new faculty contracts. The matter is on the January Chancellor's Council agenda.

2. The Chancellor announced that a new regent, Michael Gelman, has been appointed to replace Frank Gunther, who has resigned. The

Chair will send a letter from CUSF welcoming Regent Gelman.

3. The Chair announced that the implementation process for the Regents' Faculty Awards is set, and that the Student Regent, Kevin Lawrence, has been appointed as a member of the selection committee.

III. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (continued)

A. Distance Education: Regret was expressed that the agenda discussion of distance education at the Senate/Forum Chairs meeting did not occur, and that Larry Lasher's time and effort to develop materials for the discussion was not recognized. Also, the Chair reported that the System Student Council had approved a position statement on distance education which included the position that distance education not supplant the standard method of instruction as the primary mode of education.

B. Faculty Development Funding: There was a brief discussion of the issues of collaborative research and the proposal that the efforts be funded through institutional faculty development funds. It was decided that the Chair will correspond with the Chancellor and suggest the need to discuss the issue.

C. Alternate-Member By Law: The Committee briefly discussed a proposed rewording of the By Law change passed by Council at the December meeting. The intent is to provide less lengthy and awkward language, without changing the substance of the change passed by Council. The suggestion was made that the Executive Committee does not have the authority to modify the language of a motion previously approved by Council. It was decided to take the proposed rephrasing back to Council for approval.

D. January Council Agenda: In addition to the usual reports, the following were listed as items for the January Council meeting:

Alternate-Member By Law

Discussion with Chancellor Langenberg

E. The meeting adjourned at 1:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
Council of the University of Maryland System
Monday, February 24, 1997
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved as Submitted, March 31, 1997**

Present: Alexander, Chair; Cohen, UMCP; Lasher, UMBC; Rebach, UMES; Somers, TSU; Wallinger, FSU; Chancellor Langenberg, UMSA; Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. Health Benefits Negotiations: The Chair reported that UMBC had raised the question of user/CUSF participation in health-benefit negotiations, and that he had discussed the issue with Donald Tynes, Director of Human Resources. The possibility of CUSF participation is under investigation, and will be taken to CUSF when further information is available.

B. TIAA-CREF Spousal Benefits: In response to a UMBC Senate resolution and to a similar request from TSU, that CUSF pursue improved spousal benefits for TIAA-CREF retirees, the Chair said he was willing to do so. He added that similar proposals had been rejected in the past because of the high cost. Currently, TIAA-CREF retirees must have 25 years of service to be eligible for spousal benefits, while state-program retirees need only 16 years of service. It was suggested that faculty throughout UMS need to be mobilized, and that it ought to be made a major initiative for next year.

The committee decided the Chair would raise the question with the Chancellor, investigate the genesis of the eligibility differences, and address the issue in his report to the March Council meeting.

C. Junior Faculty Project: Councilor Somers reviewed the essential features of a research proposal to discover junior faculty perceptions of development efforts, the barriers to tenure and advancement, and the degree of mentoring by senior faculty. The working document proposes focus groups at each campus, moderated by non-UMS personnel, at a total cost of \$22,750, including moderator and assistant fees, a report of findings, and incidentals.

Committee discussion focused on the questions of the Chancellor's willingness to fund the proposal, the most appropriate observers, sources of reliable demographic data to identify potential focus group participants, identification of desired outcomes and/or use of the findings, and refinement of questions to stimulate participant preparation. Committee recommendations included selecting observers who are from a different campus of the same type of institution; adding questions on perceptions of their role at their institutions and perceived differences in the barriers they face, versus those faced by senior faculty; and emphasizing that the goal was to discover junior faculty perceptions and whether policy changes are needed. The Committee decided to pursue further refinement by e-mail, and to raise the question of funding with the Chancellor.

D. Tuition Alternatives: Trudy Somers circulated a pamphlet from "Tuition Exchange Incorporated," describing a tuition-exchange program of a consortium of universities, and raised the question of UMS participation. It was decided to raise the question with the Chancellor.

E. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: The Administrative Affairs Committee chair reported that the committee had met regarding the issue of full time contractual faculty. The original intended focus on treatment of contractual faculty seems to have been expanded/shifted to concern for erosion of the status of tenure-track faculty. The committee chair currently is seeking UMS data to identify number, titles, and job descriptions of non-tenure-track faculty. The committee chair will provide a preliminary report at the April CUSF meeting.

F. Executive Committee Vacancies: In response to a request to examine the By-Laws and address the question of filling vacancies occasioned by mid-term departures of Executive Committee members, the Chair will formulate a charge to the Administrative Affairs Committee to do so.

G. Dependency Documentation: The Chair reported that, pursuant to a request at the February Council meeting, the Chancellor referred him to the Director of Human Resources, Donald Tynes, to seek more flexibility in documentation required to verify spousal/dependent status for health care benefits. A memo reportedly will go out soon, specifying that alternative documentation is possible, and that accommodations should be made for faculty on sabbatical.

H. Nominations Committee: Following clarification of the number and type of affiliation of faculty needed to serve on the Regents Faculty Awards Selection Committee, it was decided that the Chair solicit for nominations. At a later point, Dr. Giles-Gee clarified the point that the faculty members of the committee need not be CUSF members.

The committee chair reported that, at the time, there was at least one candidate for election to each position on the Executive Committee. Following discussion of ways of encouraging more candidates and clarification of office sought by current declared candidates, the committee chair said he would contact the other committee members regarding further nominations.

I. Hope Scholarships: The Chair reported he had received correspondence suggesting faculty leaders need to provide letters of support for the Governor's Hope Scholarship proposal. The committee decided to seek input from the Chancellor regarding the issue.

J. March CUSF Agenda: Following discussion of a previously-distributed tentative agenda for the March CUSF meeting, Executive Committee confirmed the following as agenda items:

- Presentation by a guest from the Institute for Distance Education -- Discussion and possible action regarding distance education
- Report on Junior Faculty Research Project
- Legislative Affairs update
- Unspecified new business

K. Spring Break: A question arose at UMES whether Spring Break is a full five-day break for faculty. Dr. Giles-Gee said she would investigate and report back to Councilor Rebach.

L. UMAB APT Proposal: The Chair noted communication indicating a UMAB Medical School Council document proposed a policy whereby salary is excluded as a contractual

obligation for tenure-track faculty. At this point, there is no request for CUSF action, beyond staying informed. Dr. Giles-Gee said that until the Chancellor receives and approves such a policy, the proposal has only a draft status.

M. Faculty Salary Enhancement: Following a brief discussion, the committee decided to seek clarification from the Chancellor whether the proposed appropriation for recruitment/retention of outstanding faculty was a one-time appropriation, or whether it was to be added to the UMS budget base and/or the faculty member's salary base.

N. Guest Speakers: Following discussion, the committee decided to try to reschedule the Chancellor as a guest speaker at the May Council meeting, and to invite Senator Lawlah to address the June Council meeting.

II. MEETING WITH THE CHANCELLOR

A. UMAB APT Policy Proposal: The Chair gave a copy of the proposed UMAB Medical School APT policy to Chancellor Langenberg and requested clarification of consistency with UMS policy.

B. Hope Scholarship Support: The Chair summarized a resolution passed at the February CUSF meeting voicing support for the Hope Scholarship proposal as a means of improving high school graduates' access to college, and asked the Chancellor whether a letter to that effect was useful and sufficient support. The Chancellor replied that such a letter was both very useful and sufficient.

In response to the question of support from a broader spectrum of faculty leaders, Chancellor Langenberg said that UMS was mounting several actions in support of the Governor's proposal, and that letters from the faculty senate chairs would be helpful. He said that it is important that, if the proposal fails in the General Assembly, it not be seen as failing because of lack of UMS support.

The Chair will address a letter of support to the Chancellor, with a copy to appropriate legislators, and will e-mail CUSF members and campus senate chairs regarding the matter.

C. HB 1064: Early Retirement: The Chair referred to the CUSF resolution supporting the early-retirement legislation, raised the question of the extent of CUSF involvement in supporting HB 1064, and noted the likely perception that expressions of support would be seen as self serving. The Chancellor replied that a simple letter of support was appropriate, even if it is seen as self serving, since that would remove a potential anti-passage argument that the faculty don't care about it.

D. Budget Status: The Chancellor reported that, so far, only one cut had been proposed for the UMS operating budget appropriation: \$200,000 for staffing the new UMAB library, since the library does not come on line for six months after the beginning of FY 98.

E. Faculty Salary Enhancement: The Chair referred to statements made at the February Council meeting indicating that the \$5 million faculty retention/recruitment proposal was advanced as a one-time appropriation, and asked for clarification. Chancellor Langenberg replied that it was "a matter of interpretation." He said that, at the time it was proposed to the Governor, the impression was gained that UMS was asking only for "seed money," but that UMS was arguing that it ought to be a part of the base, and that it was an issue for future budget years, not this one. Upon further inquiry, the Chancellor confirmed that, for individual faculty, it would become part of their base salary, and that there was a possibility it would become an unfunded mandate in the future.

F. Faculty Contract: The Chair referred to the presidents' desire to reexamine the proposed faculty contract; noted CUSF concerns about application to current faculty contracts, and the wisdom of specifying pieces of the contract before developing the contract itself; and asked for clarification of the status of the proposal. Dr. Giles-Gee said that the proposed contract developed by the committee studying the issue is what would be forwarded to the BOR Education Policy Committee, and that the issue was a proposed change in the UMS APT policy specifying which portions of the faculty handbooks are and are not contractual obligations. The Chancellor said that if John Anderson's recommendation is accepted by the Regents, the provisions would apply to new faculty, and leave open the question of what is included in previous contracts, depending on what was specified in the original contract. Dr. Giles-Gee reiterated the point that, since a contract cannot be unilaterally changed, current faculty would have the option of adhering to provisions of the new contract or those of their original contract/letter of appointment .

G. Vision IV/III.1: The Chair noted frequent references by Regent Crawford to a "Vision IV," indicated that Vice Chancellor Marx said discussion was ongoing and that a proposal may appear as early as late Spring of 1997, and noted CUSF desire to be included in the discussion and CUSF concern about the rapid timetable.

The Chancellor responded that there is no formal effort underway to create a Vision IV, but there is an ongoing discussion (which he termed "Vision 3.1") of ways to refine Vision III to address a number of issues, including, among others:

- Whether we are at a transition point between an era of scarcity of resources and students, and an era of continued scarcity of financial resources and an excess demand from students.
- How to address the rapid expansion of external and internal competition.
- Identifying appropriate programmatic and clientele limitations for institutions. The Chancellor noted, for example, questions of whether the regional comprehensive institutions should have selected doctoral programs, and whether, in light of distance education and information technology advances, it makes sense to continue defining a region served by an institution.
- Whether UMS institutions are hobbled in competition for students by UMS and MHEC policies and regulations not faced by out-of-state institutions offering programs in Maryland via distance-education technologies, and, if so, how to level the competitive field.

When asked for a time line for action on the matter, Chancellor Langenberg said that, while the issues had been discussed at the Regents' Fall Retreat, and that the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee is quite interested in the issues, the primary forum for discussion had been

the Academic Advisory Council, and that it was the primary focus of a AAC retreat a week ago. Within a couple of weeks, a draft "white paper" of conclusions reached at the AAC retreat will be circulated among the chief academic officers to verify accuracy of reflection of conclusions. The Chancellor said that the appropriate time for CUSF involvement was at the point of broader circulation of the AAC White Paper, and that it could go to CUSF and Chancellor's Council simultaneously. The Chair noted that this seemed to be on a very fast track, and asked whether a Regents' policy was likely to be formulated within the next two months. The Chancellor replied that it would be a bit longer than that, but that the Regents could take action by early next Fall.

It was decided to alert Council to the upcoming proposal and to urge members to discuss the issue with their academic vice presidents.

Vice Chair Lasher noted the allusions to Vision II and references to program duplication and "under utilized" programs, and asked whether program cuts similar to those of Vision II were envisioned. The Chancellor replied that the related question addressed by AAC was whether the concepts and philosophy behind Vision II are still relevant, or whether UMS institutions should be cut loose for unfettered free-market competition, especially against institutions outside UMS. He further noted that the previous MHEC was extremely sensitive to program duplication, but that the "rules have changed because technology is rapidly undermining the conditions under which MHEC was legally charged to regulate and design higher education in Maryland. He used as an example the rumor that the Wharton School is about to offer an on-line Executive MBA program, and questioned whether MHEC had any authority to regulate what any student could take off the Internet.

When asked whether the changes rendered institutional mission statements meaningless, Chancellor Langenberg said that, while they were not meaningless, they do need to be reexamined rapidly.

H. Junior Faculty Project: The Executive Committee gave a copy of the draft Junior Faculty Research Proposal to the Chancellor and asked whether it could be funded this year, or whether it was best to delay the project until next year. The Chancellor replied that there are no funds in a UMMSA account to cover the cost of the project, but that he would raise the question at the Chancellor's Council meeting on March 3, and determine whether the presidents are willing to fund the proposal from their current budgets. Councilor Somers said she would fax a revised draft to the Chancellor to send to the presidents.

I. Lilly Conference: Councilor Somers noted that the Lilly Conference on Teaching held at Towson this year will be held again next year, with UMCP co-sponsorship and asked whether UMS was interested in joining sponsorship of the conference.

J. Department Chairs Conference: Dr. Giles-Gee suggested it was time to begin planning for the Fall, 97 Chairs Conference, and proposed calling on the same chairs as last year to serve on the planning committee. Councilor Somers volunteered to serve on the planning committee. In response to a request for suggested issues to discuss, distance education was offered as one possibility.

K. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of the December 16, 1996 Executive Committee meeting and Minutes of the December 7, 1996 Meeting of the Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate/Forum Chairs were approved as submitted.

L. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 1:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael J. Wallinger

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
Council of the University of Maryland System
Monday, March 31, 1997
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved as Submitted, April 28, 1997**

Present: Alexander, Chair; Cohen, UMCP; Lasher, UMBC; Rebach, UMES; Somers, TSU; Wallinger, FSU; Chancellor Langenberg, UMSA; Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 AM.

I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. April CUSF Agenda: Following discussion of a previously-distributed tentative agenda for the April CUSF meeting, Executive Committee confirmed the following as agenda items:

- Election of 1997-98 Executive Committee
- Presentation by Kenneth Tenore on the University of Maryland Academic Telecommunications System
- Preliminary report and discussion of proposed UMS non-discrimination policy
- Preliminary report and discussion of non-tenure-track faculty issues
- Unspecified new business

B. Non-Discrimination Policy: The Chair reviewed the history of BOR, Attorney General's Office, and CUSF positions and activities regarding a domestic partners policy and a proposed policy of non-discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, and noted the need for guidance to accurately represent CUSF in BOR discussion of the issue. The Chair confirmed scheduled BOR action at the Summer meeting, and noted a preference for advice on a series of tactical steps to be pursued, ranging from no position, to endorsement, modification, or opposition. Committee discussion included reports of preliminary reactions that the general tone of the proposed policy was objectionable, since it devoted more space to defining what is not prohibited than to what does constitute discrimination; that it may actually pose a threat to benefits for all employees, regardless of sexual orientation; and that some approved the proposed policy.

B. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: Executive Committee briefly discussed potential sources of data regarding the question of non-tenure-track faculty.

C. UMUC Faculty: The Chair announced that an appointment with UMUC President Massey had been scheduled for discussion of the questions of faculty status and UMUC representation in CUSF.

D. UMS Name-Change Legislation: The Chair read correspondence from the Legislative Affairs Committee Chair requesting guidance on the position to take regarding the proposed name changes. The Committee recommended CUSF not take a position since it is not an issue directly affecting faculty.

E. MHEC Response to Hezel Report: The Chair reviewed the recommendations of the Hezel Report, a consultant's recommendations regarding distance education policy in Maryland, and characterized the report as advising MHEC to adopt a policy of open competition among institutions, with as few restrictions as possible. The preliminary MHEC response reportedly rejected those recommendations and proposed active involvement, including certification of programs and proposed faculty reward structures. Following establishment of an MHEC ad hoc advisory committee, the report has been withdrawn, but is scheduled to be reconsidered at an April 10 meeting, with final action to be incorporated in the new state-wide plan for higher education.

The Chair reported arguing strongly for faculty inclusion in the ad hoc advisory committee, suggested the CUSF position may differ from that taken by UMS on some key provisions, and sought advice on whether or not CUSF should take a position on the issue. The Chair noted one particular item of concern: a recommendation that UMUC be designated the candidate to become Maryland's virtual university for baccalaureate-level programs. It was suggested that it is inappropriate to restrict such status to one institution, that there are significant implications for the types of faculty hired, and serious questions of quality control in a shift to a market-driven, delivery-driven system.

There was Executive Committee consensus to take a position on the issue, and that the emphasis ought to be on amendment of the response to include provision for program quality control.

II. MEETING WITH THE CHANCELLOR

A. Junior Faculty Project: The Chancellor distributed copies of the April 7 Chancellor's Council agenda, and agreed to add discussion of the proposed study of junior faculty perceptions. Lacking current approval and funding, implementation of the project will be delayed until next year.

B. Legislative Agenda Update:

1. Name Change: The Chair informed Chancellor Langenberg of the Executive Committee decision to not take a position on the name change legislation.

2. Faculty Salary Enhancement: In response to a question of the status of the appropriation for retention and recruitment of outstanding faculty, Chancellor Langenberg reported that the House had approved the full \$5 million request, while the Senate had cut \$1 million. He

suggested the most likely scenario was that the conference committee would split the difference, thus cutting \$500 thousand.

3. Early Retirement: The Chair announced the CUSF position taken in the March Council meeting to withdraw CUSF support for the bill if it was amended to require a give back of faculty positions or funds. The Chancellor said that, currently, there had been no inclusion of that provision in the bill.

4. Other Legislation: Chancellor Langenberg reported that the UMS operating and capital budgets were both in good shape, that the Hope Scholarship proposal was dead, and that the prepaid-tuition proposal probably would pass.

C. MHEC Response to Hezel Report: The Chair briefly reviewed the issue, reported Executive Committee concerns regarding quality and designation of one institution as the Maryland "virtual university," and opened the floor to discussion.

In response to a question from the Chancellor, the Chair reported that MHEC Faculty Advisory Council had not fully discussed the issue because the MHEC response had been withdrawn prior to the FAC meeting.

There was a lengthy discussion of distance education, virtual universities, models of delivery systems and degree certification, and the role/status of faculty in the shifting education paradigms. During the discussion, Chancellor Langenberg provided the following reactions to the MHEC Response to the Hezel Report and distance education in general:

-- He does not object to language that proposes MHEC-UMS discussions regarding a virtual university policy.

-- He said he would oppose designation of one institution as the Maryland virtual university. Instead, he said that all UMS institutions ought to be involved, and added that it is necessary for institutions to act now if they want to be involved in the future.

-- The most appropriate way for CUSF to provide input to the decision regarding the MHEC response is through the MHEC Faculty Advisory Council.

-- Faculty ought not to be concerned about a diminished role in virtual universities since, regardless of the delivery system, they will be in the thick of providing the education service.

-- Control of degree certification is still retained largely by the institution granting the degree, thereby retaining the essential elements of the current system of quality control.

-- There needs to be shift from a focus on the degree and granting institution to a focus on certifying skills of the degree holder.

D. Department Chairs Workshop: In response to a question from Dr. Giles-Gee, it was decided to reconstitute the 1996 conference planning committee to plan the 1997 conference. There also was discussion of targeting selected departments for attendance at the conference, but no action was taken.

E. Contractual Faculty Benefits: In response to a request for clarification of Item 2.e. on the Chancellor's Council Agenda, Chancellor Langenberg said it referred to a question of whether there ought to be a uniform UMS policy regarding the provision of benefits for contractual faculty.

III. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (Continued)

A. Correspondence Regarding Tenure: The Executive Committee briefly discussed correspondence from a CUSF Councilor requesting clarification of a comment by Regent Crawford regarding a buy out of tenure. It was decided to take no action at this time.

B. Regents Awards: The Chair announced that agreement had been reached to extend the deadline for submission of nominations to May 1. The Chair and Dr. Giles-Gee will inform the Faculty Senate Chairs and Academic Affairs Offices, respectively, of the new submission deadlines. CUSF still needs to appoint faculty to the selection committee.

C. Senate/Forum Chairs Meeting: Discussion of the Spring Senate/Forum Chairs meeting centered on potential dates and agenda items. May 3 and May 10 were identified as possible dates, and distance education was listed the most likely discussion topic. Pending further investigation, no decision was made regarding location.

D. Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the February 24 Executive Committee meeting were approved as submitted.

E. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 1:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael J. Wallinger

**Minutes of the Executive Committee of the
Council of the University of Maryland System
Monday, April 28, 1997
at University of Maryland System Administration (UMSA)
Approved as Submitted, May 30, 1997**

Present: Alexander, Chair; Cohen, UMCP; Lasher, UMBC; Rebach, UMES; Somers, TSU; Wallinger, FSU; Chancellor Langenberg, UMSA; George Marx, UMSA; Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 AM.

I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

A. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of the March 31, 1997 Executive Committee meeting were approved, as submitted, subject to e-mail correction of factual data.

B. May Council Agenda: In addition to Chair and Committee reports, the May CUSF agenda will include a presentation by Chancellor Langenberg on topics to be identified by the Executive Committee, discussion of a 1997-98 CUSF agenda and procedures, and discussion of

the proposed policy on sexual orientation.

C. UMS Policy on Sexual Orientation: Copies of the most recent draft of the proposed policy were distributed and briefly discussed. An ad hoc UMSA committee currently is meeting to review the draft and BOR action is scheduled for the July Board meeting.

D. Distance Education: It was suggested that the topic of distance education ought to be brought to closure for this year. To that end, Councilor Lasher read a draft of a communication to Chancellor Langenberg reviewing CUSF activity, proposing continued CUSF involvement next year, and sounding cautionary notes. Committee discussion focused on the tone of the cautionary notes and on appropriate procedural disposition. It was decided that a revised version would be distributed to the membership (via e-mail) for preliminary reaction, be included in the May mailing, and be brought to the floor at the May Council meeting as part of the Executive Committee Report.

E. Senate Chairs Meeting: The Chair raised the question of cancelling the May 10 meeting with the Faculty Senate Chairs and the Chancellor. Arguments offered favoring cancellation were lack of a substantive agenda and the fact that the timing of the meeting occurred too close to the end of the year for the Senate Chairs to take issues and/or information back to their campuses. On the other hand, it was noted that the meeting is stipulated in the By-Laws and that this is the only opportunity for the Senate Chairs to interact directly with the Chancellor. It was decided the Chair would poll the Senate Chairs and base the decision on their collective preference.

F. K-16: The Executive Committee approved a suggestion that the Chair and the Chair of the Education Policy Committee draft a letter regarding a CUSF position and faculty input to the K-16 Initiative. Council consideration of the letter is tentatively set for the June meeting.

G. UMUC Representation: The Executive Committee briefly discussed ways of discovering UMUC faculty attitudes regarding representation and/or input to CUSF. No action was taken.

II. MEETING WITH THE CHANCELLOR

A. Junior Faculty Project: The Chair reviewed the reactions by the President's Council to his oral presentation of the research proposal to assess the attitudes of junior tenure-track faculty. Reportedly, the presidents liked the concept and were impressed with the research design. They also suggested revision to include non-tenure-track faculty and sought information on the desired outcome and questions to be asked of the subjects in the proposed focus groups. The Chair responded that expanding the project would drive up the cost for the institutions and probably would require two separate studies. He also indicated that a formal proposal would be provided for President's Council action at their next meeting.

The Executive Committee and the Chancellor agreed that, given the significantly different circumstances and issues involved, it is inappropriate to include non-tenure-track faculty in the present study. It was decided to advance the proposal as a study of tenure-track faculty only, itemize the cost for each institution, and project the potential cost of a separate study of

non-tenure-track faculty.

Discussion of topics to be addressed as common issues in the focus groups included the following possibilities, among others:

- The comparative implications for research faculty hired with "hard money" versus those hired with a portion of their salary coming from "soft money."
- Perception of institutional expectations, including timing of the tenure decision point, appropriate weighting of the assessment components, and standards for granting tenure.
- Whether necessary institutional support is provided to meet expectations.
- Perception of the societal role played by them and their institution.
- Whether they perceive their institution placing a high priority on the teaching mission.
- Quality of work life, such as technical support, library and computer facilities.
- Priorities of self definition as a member of a discipline, versus a member of an institution.
- Rigidity of disciplinary boundaries and opportunities for interdisciplinary activities, and perceived implications for the reward system and tenure.
- Desired and perceived expectations of level of involvement in institutional activities and service.
- What attracted them to accept a position at their institution, what would lead them to remain, and what advice would they give for recruiting the next member of their department?

B. Global Learning Center: The Chancellor and Dr. Marx summarized UMS intentions regarding a proposed facility that would allow UMS to respond to the challenges and opportunities posed by distance education technologies. The building, at a projected cost of \$25 million, would be located in proximity to the high-tech. industry in Montgomery County, and will be sponsored by Montgomery County in the Legislature. The first priority is to get the building into the queue of the capital budget projects. While the details need to be ironed out over the next few months, they said the concept has been set.

According to Dr. Marx, the facility would provide access for all UMS institutions to offer programs and services throughout the world, as well as throughout the state. Also, it is seen as a way to study the process of educational material development and delivery in terms of their efficiency and effectiveness. In response to a question of CUSF input, Dr. Marx reiterated the point that there would not be a separate institution or a separate degree; instead, it would provide access for all institutions to market their programs via such delivery systems. In response to the question whether the system would be available for faculty entrepreneurial activity or only for institutional programs, the Chancellor said both would be possible, and reiterated the point that it would be available for faculty research on technology and distance learning. In response to the question of administrative responsibility, it was suggested that current intent is for UMSA to administer the facility. In response to a range of other issues, the point was reiterated that the details still need to be worked out.

C. Regents Faculty Awards: Dr. Giles-Gee reiterated the need for CUSF to appoint two more faculty from the research institutions to serve on the selection committee, which needs to meet in June, at the latest.

III. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING, CONTINUED

A. UB Senate Request: Pursuant to a request from the UB Faculty Senate for clarification of UMS policy regarding non-renewal of untenured tenure-track faculty, the Executive Committee discussed the appropriate way to address the request. It was decided the Chair would make an inquiry whether there is a UMS policy, and, if so, what it is. Depending on the results of that inquiry, the Chair will consult with the UB Councilors to decide whether further CUSF action is warranted or desired.

B. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 12:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael J. Wallinger

**CUSF Executive Committee
Minutes of Meeting
September 29, 1997
(Approved October 27, 1997)**

Drs. Alexander, Block, Lasher, McClive, Rebach, Siegel

Guests Present: Dr Giles-Gee - USM, Mr Donald Tynes - USM

Minutes of August 25, 1997 meeting approved as submitted.

State-Wide Plan for Higher Education

Dr Alexander reported that he would testify that day as a private person at the Maryland Higher Education Committee (MHEC) hearings on the Maryland State-Wide Plan for Higher Education. He noted that his purpose was to let the Committee know that the Faculty were interested in the document, and that both FAC and CUSF would formally comment in the future.

He noted that the major problems concerning the MHEC Faculty Advisory Council (MHEC/FAC) were a) the Review of Teacher Ed and Nursing Ed and b) the need for more minority males to enter education.

He also noted that MHEC wants faculty to be more involved With pre-college Education, including in-service and pre-service, and desires that tenure and promotion review be modified to reflect this involvement. The Committee expressed concern that the tenor of the Plan and of the MHEC seems to be accusatory and tends not to recognize that many of their desires are being addressed, although not necessarily exactly as they wish.

Dr Siegel reported on the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) Conference. She reported that the plenary speakers focused on technology and that there were few participants

from higher education or from the high school classroom. She also noted a seeming disconnect between the plenary speakers and the people in the workgroups.

Members of the small workgroups, teachers, parents and students, wanted the high schools to provide a broad, liberal education, and seemed to be upset that the speakers at the plenary session seemed to want the high schools to provide only job training. Workgroups recognized that many people do not wish to go to college, but wish to enter skilled, technical career, and believed that high schools should prepare students for life as "good dozens", not necessarily as college students.

Dr Siegel noted that the consequences for CUSF were that some members of the working groups were hoping to de-emphasize research as part of the professional role of college professors.

It was decided that Dr Siegel would report on the Conference at the next CUSF meeting.

Committee Assignments

The Executive Committee discussed assignment of Council members to the standing Committees. Criteria included expressed desire, past experience, availability.

Early Retirement Incentives

Mr Donald Tynes - Human Resources Director of the University System of Maryland (USM) discussed the letter sent from the State Retirement Agency to employees regarding transferring between the Teacher's and Employee's Pension and Retirement Systems (TR/PS and ER/PS). Mr Tynes noted that USM has various people in the TR/PS who are not faculty or associate staff. Academic Administrator and non-classified associate staff are in TR/PS.

Mr Tynes noted that assignment to a particular system is based on job classification. Faculty must stay in the TR/PS. Some full-time Academic Administrators might be eligible to switch.

With respect to the proposed legislation, Mr Tynes noted that the institutions need the faculty positions and can't afford to give back 60% of the vacated lines as per SBI legislation. System is studying the Morgan State University buyout plan, where faculty eligible for retirement were given a cash payment as a retirement incentive.

Mr Tynes outlined the development of a "buyout" plan. USM is creating a Task Force to prepare an incentive plan for faculty parallel With the development of legislation. Dr Giles-Gee noted that there will be faculty on the task group.

Various problems were discussed by the Executive Committee. Among these were:

Institutions want to be able to hire back faculty, at least temporarily, until slots can be filled. Legislators view this as double dipping. Legislators would like to recover a portion of the vacated lines, because they see retirement incentives as a downsizing tool, but institutions need to keep the lines to do their job.

Individual institutions will have to use their own funds for the buyout. Bowie State University, Coppin State University, University of Maryland Eastern Shore and Towson University have the greatest numbers of eligible faculty. Some USM funds will have to be used to help them out.

The fraction of Contractual Employees is going up. Although USM is preparing policies to provide holiday pay, sick leave, health benefits, accumulation of leave to these employees, it is not a healthy long-term trend.

The Executive Committee directed the Legislative Affairs Committee to meet with appropriate legislators and USM administrators to survey what can be accomplished in the way of legislation.

Chair Will e-mail the membership asking for volunteers for the Task Group.

System Strategic Plan

The Chair Will discuss with the Chancellor a proposal to put a representative of CUSF standing Committees as ex officio members of the new AAAC Committees. Liaison will be between:

Program	- Administrative Affairs
K-16	- Education Policy
Minority Achievement	- Administrative Affairs
Faculty Affairs	- Faculty Development

The Secretary will send Dr McClive's report on the State-Wide Plan for Postsecondary Education to the membership for Comment and review. The Administrative Affairs Committee Will prepare a report for submission to CUSF and MHEC.

Dr. McClive will prepare a short statement for oral presentation at MHEC hearings in Frostburg on October 8. The Executive Committee provided guidelines to Dr. McClive for preparation of her oral testimony: remediation is not primarily a concern of the 2-yr schools, post-secondary education is not just workforce training,

Dr Giles-Gee Passed out the minutes of the Board of Regents Education Policy Committee - September 23, 1997.

The Task Group on Retirement Incentives will be composed of 2 Vice Presidents, 2 Faculty, and 2 Staff. CUSF will recommend four names.

The Academic Administrators Advisory Council (AAAC) Committees will have faculty representation. It has not yet been decided how the committees will be appointed or distributed. Regents will also serve on Committees.

Dr Giles-Gee reported on the new Principles for Program Development. She noted that the 2+2 Initiative will require that the 4-year institutions provide program guides to the two-year schools for articulation. Four-year schools will have to guarantee that if students take articulated courses, they will count toward the bachelors degree.

Also, the two-year schools will have to inform 4-yr schools of any interest in offering upper division courses. Four-year schools will have right of first refusal in cooperative efforts. She also noted that BOR policy no longer recognizes exclusive rights to regional "turf". We may all cooperate with each other anywhere.

Distance Education

The Distance Education task force has not yet gelled. CUSF will be asked to recommend faculty for inclusion.

Other Items

The Executive Committee discussed the agenda and arrangements for the upcoming CUSF/Senate Chairs meeting.

Shady Grove Center Concern expressed regarding division of telecommunication funding. The Executive Committee agreed that this was purely an administrative problem.

The Executive Committee prepared the Agenda for the October, 14 meeting of the Council.

NEXT MEETING: OCTOBER 27,1997

MINUTES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING OF CUSF 2/23/98

The meeting was convened at Adelphi at 10:00 a.m. Present were Alexander, Lasher and Siegel. In the absence of a quorum the committee did not consider motions or take any other formal action.

1. The draft minutes of 2/2 were reviewed; the chair was directed to seek amendment and approval through e-mail communication the full committee.
2. There was a brief discussion of the situation for next year re the executive committee. It was observed that several positions needed to be filled. Professors Siegel and Lasher indicated their willingness to continue in their present positions pending the results of the Nomination Committees discussions with the membership. It was noted that the need for an effective secretary was particularly critical for next year.
3. Professor Siegel distributed a proposed draft statement to be forwarded to USM as input into the draft of "Partnerships for Teacher Education" which will be revised for presentation to the Regents at their next meeting. After discussion Professor Siegel was asked to submit a reviseddraft for submission to USM, Because of the press of time it will not be possible to solicit suggestions from the general membership. The revised statement will be circulated to the

members of the Executive Committee for approval before it is forwarded and will be an information item at the March meeting of the Council.

4. There was brief discussion of a request for support for a study of Higher Education funding in Maryland vs. expenditures for prisons from a policy institute in Washington D.C. The chair had read the report and while he noted that there was much in it that was provocative there seemed no appropriate response from CUSF in the context of its mission and mandate.

5. At this point (11:00 a.m.) the committee was joined by Gertrude Eaton, Helen Giles-Gee, George Marx and Skip Myers from USM, and Kay Gilcher and Margaret Chambers of UMUC/IDE (Instituted for Distance Education) to discuss the Web Initiative in Teaching to support the development of Web-based courses in the USM through a program of summer workshops and shared resources. The discussion focussed on a range of topics including the following:

Probably about 45 faculty in teams of 3 to develop "second generation" web courses.

Issue of resources; who pays for released time and other costs?

Gestation time--six months not long enough

Full courses as proposed (with no class meetings) or fractions of courses? Less ambitious an agenda?

New course or existing courses. Less departmental difficulty with the former.

Availability of grant funds to support a program like this one.

UMUC's role beyond workshops

Funding for follow-up and revision

Need for careful feedback and evaluation

Importance of developing understanding of implications of learning theory and pedagogical strategies--more important than the technical side.

The executive committee agreed to send representatives to a planning meeting on Thursday, 2/26.

6. The next portion of the meeting was a discussion between the committee and Chancellor Langenberg. The discussion focussed on the need for more and better staff and faculty development programs within USM; issues discussed included the possibility of cooperative programs for faculty and staff and for UMUC as a potential resource for faculty and staff development. The discussion closed with some discussion of legislative matters, i.e., the trust fund (slot machine bill), the formula finding bill and the task force to examine the organization of USM.

7. The rest of the meeting was devoted to discussion of the agenda for the 3/17 meeting at UB which will include the presentation of a slate next year from the nominating committee and a draft report from Education Policy on the Maryland Teacher Education Task Force. It was agreed that the agenda was subject to revision by the chair should later developments warrant.

Draft minutes
cusf executive committee meeting
5/26/98

Present: Lasher, McClive, Siegel

1. The committee approved the minutes of the executive committee of 4/27. The draft will be revised as discussed and forwarded to the chair by Dr. McClive for inclusion in the packet for the 6/19 meeting at Coppin.
2. The first item discussed was the Chair's Workshop scheduled for late October. The steering committee is being chaired by M. McClive and includes Trudy Sommers (TSU), Jim McKusick (UMBC), an Assistant to the Provost at UMCP (name?) and others? Current thinking is to accept Helen's advice and do it in a single section though MM continues to consider a western site in the Hagerstown area for Frostburg and whomever else. There was agreement that inclusion of K-16 as an agenda item is a good idea. There was also some discussion of possible connections between the first meeting with the senate chairs in early October and the workshop to no particular conclusion--for a subsequent agenda.
3. There ensued discussion of the Regents Awards program and the lack of publicity for same. Per the minutes of 4/27, MM will send out a letter to senate chairs over Steve's signature alerting them to the existence of the awards and outlining the general process and schedule. Steve will follow up on e-mail.
4. Re the on-going governance study and the 4/27 minutes, the chair will remind the liaisons to consult with senate chairs and be prepared to report at the June meeting on the current state of the study on the campuses. MM will send each liaison a copy of what she has received to date. The agenda for 6/19 will include Marci' report on governance and up-dates from liaisons.
5. Another item on the 6/19 agenda will be a brief presentation from the chair on the role and responsibilities of council members.
6. Discussion followed of the current state of "Pathways" and the charge to bring a preliminary report to the 6/19 meeting on strategies for meeting the challenge of #5 and *6 in that document and the full document as well. After a good deal of discussion, the committee concluded that the chair and the executive committee should attempt to put together a working group made up of members of the council (perhaps excom members) and representatives from the institutions, either senate chairs or their designees. The charge to this group would be to educate themselves re the Pathways document and

the regents' ART document and to meet with the chancellor and/or other administrative officers in order to discuss the "Pathways" document with the chancellor and other appropriate administrators with specific attention to items *5 and *6, on appointments, rewards, promotions, workload and productivity. The working group will present a report to the council at the earliest possible date with will recommend a specific response to *5 and *6 and such other propositions in "Pathways" as appropriate. The working group should be chaired by a member of the executive committee and shall start its deliberations at the earliest possible date in order to be able to complete its report during the fall semester. The committee agreed that the propositions contained in Pathways are of sufficient moment that the council should reserve the right to reject the propositions and should in no case take positions on these propositions without significant involvement by the insitutional governance organizations. At the same time, the committee recognized the right and responsibility of the chancellor to raise these questions and the need for a timely and thoughtful response from the faculty. The committee suggests that the council ask the chair, in consultation with the executive committee, to appoint the "Pathways" faculty working group and to set a calendar for its work, including its final report to the council.

7. There was further discussion in the direction of finding ways to link the Working Group to the Chairs' workshop in October and the agenda of the first meeting with Senate Chairs early in October, this to be explored further.

8. The tentative date for the first chairs' meeting is October 3 and the chair was charged to clear the chancellor's calendar for that date. The projected date for the chairs' workshop is October 31 for a single session in College Park with a possible western meeting on October 16 in Frostburg.

9. K-16 as an agenda item for next executive committee meeting. The chair is to invite Nancy Shapiro to that meeting to explore ways in which cusf can support the k-16 project.

10. The committee discussed the failure to attract proposals for the faculty development grants.

Suggestion is that we might tie this in to the K-16 effort; this would be worth talking with Nancy. Might also be connected to the distance education (WIT) program in some way. The feeling is that the program needs some sort of definition beyond "collaboration." An agenda item for Coppin? Perhaps 4X\$2500.

11. Some concern was expressed abou the process by which Regents' awards are handled on the campuses. Dave Nicols at FSU and Ed Orser at UMBC were

mentioned as possible contact people.

12. The agenda for 6/16 will include:

Shared Governance (Marci and liaisons)

Pathways--proposal for working group. (Lasher and excom)

Discussion of BOR awards through faculty?? (Dave Nicols)

Chairs' workshop (Marci)

Responsibilities of members (Lasher)

Faculty development grants --k-16, distance ed

Drug and Alcohol Abuse Policy (Johnson)

Introduction of new members and state of the roster
for AY 1995-99

MINUTES

Executive Committee--CUSF

June 29, 1998

The meeting of the CUSF Executive Committee was called to order at 10:00 am.

In Attendance: Lasher (UMBC), Erskine (SSU), Rebach (UMES), Alexander (UMCP), and, via IVAN, Mcclive (FSU).

Chair Lasher reported on events since the CUSF meeting of June 19, 1998. Action on the Drug and Alcohol Policy has slowed, and CUSF has had a good response to its input on the policy.

Erskine will be the MHEC--FAC representative from SSU; Dr. Mary Rogers will represent UMB; and we still need representatives from UB and University College. Chair Lasher will follow up on the two unrepresented schools.

The Pathways Document will go to the Educational Policies Committee of the Board of Regents at their November meeting. We have some CUSF members who are willing to participate on Pathways revision over the summer: Collins, Havas; and other people were suggested as being possible "revisionists": Jeffries, Cohen, Little, and Fruchtmann. The ad hoc committee, once completed, will meet later in the summer after the new Pathways Document is on the web page for the system. (It appears that the focus is shifting from Propositions 5 and 6 to Proposition 8, the creation of the "virtual university.")

There was a discussion of the \$10,000 Faculty Development Grant, which focuses on collaborative proposals--this grant was not awarded this year. There was only one applicant. Reasons for a dwindling number of applications were offered, and the Executive Committee suggested that we attempt to keep the "collaborative" part of the grant but expand the focus to

stress on-campus technical training for faculty. Rebach was named Ad- hoc Chair of the Faculty Development Committee--he will draft a new proposal for the grant and discuss it with Dr. Marx.

Chair Lasher reminded the Executive Committee of the November deadline for campus nominations for Regents Awards. Senate chairs have been contacted, and campus presidents will also be contacted.

Rather than send a letter to the Board of Regents regarding the System faculty losing ground in terms of the 85th percentile, Chair Lasher will discuss the matter when he makes his next report to the Board of Regents.

McClive reported on the Chairs' Workshop. There will be four workshops at different locations around the state with the first one being at Hagerstown in the fall. The focus of the first one will be "building a department."

McClive will send a summary of the Governance findings, the documents and completed forms to Chair Lasher, who will forward them to the new chair of the Faculty Development Committee. This will be done by the end of July.

With Nancy Struna and Martha Siegel being off the Executive Committee, there was some discussion about replacing vacancies on the Executive Committee. If it's necessary, Chair Lasher will issue a broad call for nominations for vacant offices and there will be an email ballot. There will then be a similar procedure to fill at-large vacant seats on the Executive Committee.

The minutes of the May 26, 1998 Executive Committee meeting were approved.

Nancy Shapiro briefly joined the meeting and discussed the K-16 situation. She noted that the math area was the most "problematic" of the fields.

Secretary Erskine was urged to compile a complete roster of delegates to CUSF and to put together a schedule of meetings. The Executive Committee voted to continue the present policy of circulating the monthly meetings throughout the USM campuses. The first meeting will be at UMCP on September 15.

Respectfully submitted, Tom Erskine

DRAFT Minutes:
CUSF Executive Committee
9-28-98

All members were present when the meeting was called to order at 10:10. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as amended (adjustments to language)

Since there was no host yet for the January CUSF meeting, we decided to ask USMH to

host the meeting. [Dr. Marx agreed to this and suggested having the Chancellor speak to the whole group at this meeting.]

A committee consisting of Larry Goldman, Steve Rebach and Stephenie Gibson is at work on a next reaction to the proposed faculty drug and alcohol abuse policy. While understanding Dr. Marx's observation that we needed to move on with this on a rather tight schedule (policy is to go to the Regents Ed. Policy Committee on November 11), Larry Lasher informed us that the committee is still working, that we do not have a draft report from them yet, and cannot really anticipate how the entire CUSF group will react to the committee report during the October meeting. Our meeting with the Chancellor and the Senate Chairs is scheduled for October 9, under the leadership of Steve Havas. While not all chairs will be able to attend, work is going on to have suitable representation from all the institutions. We agreed that it would be helpful to request that the Chancellor be prepared to discuss and respond to most of the items on the proposed agenda: Pathways, shared governance, comprehensive review of tenured faculty, faculty salaries [but not necessarily to the credit transfer issues nor the question of CUSF Senate communications and collaborations].

Our appointments to the 11 pathways Committees'1 are complete; in most cases, these committees have already begun meeting. They will make draft informational (not policy) reports to the Regents in November. The "virtual University" committee has also begun its meetings but has no early reporting deadlines.

Larry Lasher has, with a few exceptions, completed the appointment of our own CUSF committees, as listed in the Meeting Agenda. These committees will have first meetings during lunch at the October CUSF meeting. We also assigned issues to the committee:

- a. pathways coordination: Ed. Policy;
- b. expansion of regents awards to include mentoring: Ed Policy;
- c. hbi issues : deferred until we have suitable budget information;
- d. revision of faculty development grant program : Faculty Affairs;
- e. k-16: Ed Policy;
- f. shared governance: Faculty Affairs;
- g. web page: Administrative Affairs (Lade);
- h. by-laws, self-study, roles and responsibilities of members: Administrative Affairs;
- i. our (non)budget: Administrative Affairs;
- j. faculty salaries: faculty affairs.

The annual Chairs Conference is well organized in its planning, but commitments to attend are lower than anticipated; some institutions have no representation so far.

George Marx reminded us of the schedule for the four-year budget proposal: the budget passes from the Governor to the Legislature on December 23, and so is rather set already. We need to find various ways of making faculty more aware of the long lead time involved in budget creation and more able to make appropriate input into this process. Joe Vivona will probably make a presentation of the coming budget for us at our November meeting and so elicit our support in this process of getting the budget approved in the Legislature.

George Marx also reminded us that performance-based assessments for graduation are likely to be required both for high school students and for newly graduate teachers. as part of k-16. This led to considerable discussion of how such assesments can be carried out, everything from student portfolios to standardized national or state exams for college graduation. we agreed that it is important that faculty be actively involved in setting such standards.

At the request of Steve havas, we agreed to request that all hosts of CUSF meetings plan meals so that “heart healthy” alternatives are always available for those who desire them.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00.