

CUSF Executive Committee Meetings, 1998-1999

This file contains draft minutes of meetings held on 8/24/98, 9/28/98, 10/9/98 (with Senate Chairs), 10/26/98, 11/30/98 and 1/11/99. **No other minutes are available.**

Preliminary MINUTES

CUSF Executive Committee Meeting

August 24, 1998

Members Present: Bill Chapin, UMES; John Collins, UMBI; Steve Havas, UMB; Larry Lasher, UMBC; Marci McClive, FSU; Steve Rebach, UMES; representing Central Administration: T. J. Bryan, George Marx.

The meeting came to order shortly after ten a.m. After discussion, the minutes of the last executive committee meeting were approved as distributed. There was general agreement that the now-open position of CUSF Secretary needs filling as quickly as is consistent with our rules of operation. We may also need to consider finding an MHEC FAC representative from CUSF to relieve our Chair from some of the meetings that he must attend.

The "Pathways" document has been accepted by the Ed Policy Committee and the full Board of Regents as eight propositions for discussion within the system; there is to be a progress-report style response to the BOR by November. As George Marx explained later, committees of faculty, some representatives to be nominated by CUSF, are being set up for work during to September to respond to sections five and six, those of most direct faculty concern. A meeting at UMBC earlier in the summer, led by Larry Lasher, brought forth reports of significant non-responsiveness to solicited faculty commentary and led to a letter to the Chancellor to that effect.

In the matter of the collaborative faculty development grants, it was noted that, although \$10,000 was available last year, no applications suitable for funding were received. Discussion centered around the possibilities of decreasing the number of awards made available and increasing the expected amount correspondingly from the current \$2000 and the possibility of enlarging the possible scope of acceptable applications, possibly toward activities strengthening us in areas of newer technologies.

On the other hand, The process of the Regents Awards to faculty seemed to go rather well last year, except for the need for greater publicity, perhaps through "Maryland on My Mind" and other external media. Since nominations are again due in November, we may need to send out reminders in October.

The report on salary questions and the seeming inability of our system to keep up with our relative positions vis a vis peer institutions as they advance (much less to approach some sort of parity with those institutions) made at the July Regents meeting was hear but elicited little response.

The workshop for department heads, to be held this October in Hagerstown, is moving forward in fine order, as evidenced by the packets that Marci distributed to us. Information will go to senate chairs also, and onto our web page or the System page. Some schools have already committed to sending as many as twenty department heads.

Shared governance remains a matter of considerable concern, given the specific problems reported earlier from several campuses, the lack of any systematized periodic surveying of faculty

from the various campuses to verify official compliance reports and a perception that the Chancellor might do more to impress campus administrators of his view of the importance of shared governance.

Upon the arrival of T. J. Bryan and George Marx, discussion shifted again to the work to be done on the "Pathways" document. Four different committees, to each of whom we are to make two nominations, are being set up to deal with specific issues in sections five and six, probably through multiple meetings in September to prepare a response in October for the Regents meeting in November. It was suggested that expanding these committees from three members to five would lead to a more representative responsive process. There is also a committee that will deal with section eight (the virtual university) for which we might suggest members; the schedule for this committee will proceed as a somewhat slower pace.

A more current version of the drug and alcohol abuse document was distributed, with explanations from T. J. Bryan of the necessity of various parts, based on the corresponding Executive Order. George Marx and T. J. Bryan agreed to produce an annotated version of the document with the appropriate reference from the executive order inserted. There followed some discussion of how one might determine what modifications to the official executive order were allowable. It became clear that it was particularly important that those making decisions concerning the enforcement of this policy on the campuses have the appropriate technical expertise and training, thus eliminating department heads, for example from this role.

The meeting of the CUSF Executive Committee and the Senate heads will take place on October 9, from 9:00 - 3:00 at Central Administration(?), under the leadership of Steve Havas.

Earlier work in the mentoring of minority students headed toward careers in the life sciences has led to the possibility of a general faculty award in the area of mentoring, particularly of students from under-represented minorities, but not limited to the life sciences. Such an award could follow the form of the current regents awards (three awards per year, same \$500 amount, CUSF participation in selection process), with additional funding going toward the support of student participation in research conferences, etc. The likely startup date would be one year from now.

Marci McClive distributed her final report on shared governance, continuing on the discussion reported earlier in this meeting. In addition to the known campuses with major areas of campus-wide contention, there would appear to be large numbers of individual questions from specific areas on specific campuses. We need some method of obtaining regular reporting from the faculty level on all campus and some method of encouraging the Chancellor to impress the importance of actual success in this area on all campus administrative heads.

Several technical difficulties have arisen. The lack of elections for CUSF representatives at UMCP leaves us several people short (we will probably accept the old people for September and rely on Denny Gulick's word to have appropriate new people for October); the situation of faculty governance bodies at BSU has not completely clarified itself; we need replacement representatives from UMBC; UMUC will be sending a non-voting representative starting in the fall. It is likely that we need to enforce our own rules on regular attendance ("three strikes") and to assure that all members are active committee participants. Committees for the fall will include Ed. Policy (Joyce?), Administrative Affairs, Faculty Development (Steve Rebach), and a new ad hoc Faculty Affairs committee (Steve Havas), perhaps to be incorporated into the bylaws as a standing committee eventually.

After some discussion of the value of outside speakers at the monthly meetings (regents,

legislators, etc.), the meeting was adjourned a little after two p.m.

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 "Pathways Committees" 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 assessments 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.

MINUTES

CUSF Executive Committee/Senate Chairs Meeting October 9, 1998

Present: Larry Lasher, UMBC (Chair, CUSF), Steve Havas UMB (Vice Chair, CUSF), Bill Chapin UMES (Secretary, CUSF), John Collins UMBI (Delegate-at-large, CUSF); Sidney Walker (BSU Senate Chair), Alcott Arthur (CSU Senate Chair), John O'Rourke (FSU Senate Chair), Donald Whaley (SSU Senate Chair), Keith Martin (TSU Senate representative), Bruce Rollier (UB Senate Chair), Joe McLaughlin (UMB Senate President), Sandy Parker (UMBC Senate Chair), Rosemary Jagus (UMBI Senate Chair), Denny Gulick (UMCP Senate Chair).

The meeting was convened at 10 AM by Steve Havas. General discussion before the arrival of Chancellor Langenberg centered on shared governance, the "Pathways" document, and post-tenure review. In the area of shared governance, there was concern that, on about half the campuses, the reports of the Presidents on the presence of shared governance did not coincide with survey reports from faculty senates and others about their perceptions of the actual state of shared governance, either at the departmental level, at the school or college level, or at the campus level. In addition, the problem of perceived lack of true shared governance between system administration and the CUSF was noted.

There was some indication that many of the problems resulted from the actions of particular administrators (rather than the system in the abstract), from the perceived lack of firm leadership in this area from the top down (Chancellor to Presidents), the lack of consultation, or consultation solicited by administration but not responded to or even acknowledged. On the other had, it was generally acknowledged that faculty and their representatives sometimes need to do a better job of communication with the various groups on campus, and to show more willingness in serving on the committees that make shared governance possible.

The "Pathways" document was viewed as an example of top-down administration, of lack of

"responsiveness to faculty responses", but also as an example of partial success in that intervention by CUSF, the Provosts, and the Senates did seem to have the result of slowing the process down, leading to reformulation of parts of the document and the appointment of faculty members to committees to look at some document areas that are highly relevant to the faculty (in the view of the administration). It was also not quite clear exactly what great sense of urgency pushed the rather short-term deadlines that appear for so many of the activities concerned with "Pathways".

Post-tenure review was seen as a success for shared governance on most campuses, with documents normally created by faculty bodies, and incorporating language recognizing ways to be helpful rather than punitive when faculty deficiencies occur. Since this work was done corresponding to a legislative mandate, it seems likely that the process will actually be carried out.

These initial discussions were summarized for the Chancellor, who joined the meeting along with T.J. Bryan at 11:30. A very active discussion occurred between the Chancellor and the CUSF Executive Committee/Senate Chairs over the following 2 hrs. and 15 minutes.

Chancellor Langenberg observed that faculty might be wishing to have it both ways on shared governance: we wanted him to bear down from the top on the Presidents to insure they understand the Chancellor's support for shared governance, but in general we did not want direct intervention and control from the top. He indicated that he was familiar with some of the problem campuses for shared governance and that, as we provided him with information about particular problem areas, he would take appropriate action.

In the area of the "Pathways" document, Chancellor Langenberg indicated that we should not view the document as a plan to be implemented, but as a set of talking points, a plan to be debated. He was willing to hear discussion of what would be a reasonable time to get to a decision in these areas, but indicated that we could not go on talking forever and compared this work with the general rule of nine-month searches to fill positions, six months in the case of presidential searches.

Chancellor Langenberg also discussed the K-16 situation, the change to standards-based evaluation, the positive effect of the current MSPAP tests (we have already reached to point of 80% of the secondary school students planning to continue their education, well on the way to "universal college education"), the necessity of "high stakes" state-wide examinations for high school students (examinations that effect how the student graduates from high school), the recognition that the teacher is the most important factor in student success in school and our concomitant responsibility for producing good teachers (not just the Colleges of Education, but all those in arts and sciences teaching these students and providing part of a good liberal education), the necessity of adjusting the faculty rewards structure to reflect this responsibility (and other new responsibilities like the Virtual University), and the "gross misapprehension" that K-16 will lead to forced admissions of unsuitable students by the university campuses.

Chancellor Langenberg also stressed the likelihood of eventual nationwide exit examinations for all college graduates, in view of the certification requirements already in place in various

professional fields, and the perceived inadequacies of university preparation in other places (specifically citing the "Massachusetts debacle".) He asked the group about giving consideration as to how this might be done here, saying the Legislature would probably require it within several years.

Chancellor Langenberg was supportive of the use of electronic media to assure the rapid dissemination of current information in areas such as K-16 and "Pathways" and the use of such media to facilitate direct discussion on all levels. He indicated that more rapid response than the traditional academic model will be needed since "Fortune favors the prepared", particularly in a world changing as rapidly as ours.

After the Chancellor left, everyone agreed that the meeting was very beneficial, that we should be active in setting up and using appropriate electronic communications, and that we should probably meet twice during the second semester, the first time in January.

The meeting was adjourned at 2 PM.

CUSF Executive Committee Meeting
DRAFT Minutes
10/26/98

The meeting was called to order by Larry Lasher at 10:15 when all were present except Steve Havas who had a teaching commitment.

1. In the process of reviewing the minutes of the previous meeting, we learned that there could well be another draft of the faculty drug and alcohol policy for consideration at the November meeting. [This was later confirmed by T. J., who indicated that, using notes and comments from our committee, she had been working on a revised version, that she hoped to meet with Steve Rebach and others next week and that, if all could be completed by next weekend, there might be a version approved by John Anderson's office in time for our consideration in November.]
2. We also learned that Steve Havas is organizing a January meeting of the Executive Committee with the Senate Chairs, and that our own agenda for the November general CUSF meeting will include a talk by Joe Vivona on the asking budget. Nancy Struna is to arrange appropriate questions on our part, particularly concerning how we (and faculty in general) can become more proactive in the budgeting process. If the Southern Education Foundation report on the HBI's arrives in time, there may also be questions about the funding of CSC, UMES and BSU
3. The rest of the morning will be spent on the chair's report, the system report, reports from the Pathways committees, etc. In the afternoon, we will consider the current version of the drug and alcohol policy and hear reports from our own committees.
4. After this discussion, the minutes of the September excom meeting were approved as distributed. The minutes for the Baltimore meeting, for the system Telecom Committee meeting

and for the meeting with the Senate heads have also been distributed as appropriate. T.J.'s large packet of materials for the Department Chair's meeting this weekend is also complete.

5. There are still complications with the Regent's Faculty Award process. The original (and thus far unchanged) organization of having two awards in each category for the research institutions and one for the comprehensives, adopted on the basis of faculty population and to assure that not all the awards would end up going to a small number of institutions, had led to some questions of fairness and so has been referred to the Education Policy Committee which will review the current plan both in this context and in the light of a suggested addition of a mentoring award. The program will not be changed for this year. We also need to pick five readers to evaluate the entries submitted, two from research campuses, two from comprehensives and an additional person who may be from either. Larry will contact the Senate chairs and the CUSF campus liaisons to generate candidates; if this proves insufficient, we can search for more candidates at the November general meeting. T.J. confirmed that, while the applications are due in November, the evaluation process was more likely to start in January.

6. Although there was little to report from the MHECFAC meeting, other processes, such as the activities of the Task Force on the university system, proceed apace. There will be regional public meetings, one shortly at UMBC at which Larry may speak on the System as a rationalizing factor amidst highly varying campus demands.

7. Now that the UMCP delegation is complete, CUSF is missing only two representative from UMBC plus the Bowie delegation. T.J. provided us with a copy of the proposed faculty council document from Bowie. We need to confirm whether this has been officially approved by the faculty at Bowie yet and whether that group will soon be selecting CUSF delegates. This will become an agenda item in November if there is not clear resolution by then.

8. Since the last BOR Ed Policy Committee did not take place as planned, the agenda may be rather full this time. Larry will attend. Similarly, our own committees will begin to give monthly reports, starting at the November 18th meeting, reflecting their (hoped-for) high level of activity.

At this point in the meeting (c. 11:00 a.m.) the Chancellor and T.J. Bryant arrived.

9. The Chancellor talked about the draft "Maryland Learning Enterprise" document. While some of the language ("In 1998, the Board of Regents and the USM ADOPTED Pathways to Perpetual Learning...", "the thrust of the USM PLANNING document, Pathways") in the document did not seem to reflect more recent understanding of the current status of the Pathways document, the Chancellor discussed MLE in terms of what has been going on over the past few years in the System. For example the Downtown Baltimore Center, under the direction of Jim Hill, in cooperation with local business and industry, has allowed penetration of the Baltimore market by the UMCP Executive MBA program, the UMES Hotel and Restaurant Management Program, and the FSU Parks and Recreation program. The Chancellor's description of this situation is the "end of academic cartels in Maryland." Similarly, the Shady Grove Center, now with over five thousand enrollments and over one hundred thousand square feet of classroom-academic space had allowed the penetration of the large Montgomery County market by the UMCP Executive

MBA program, many UMUC programs and programs from four other institutions within the system. The MLE document thus represents a start in determining how to respond to this sort of situation in general, e.g., how to act were it to be suggested at some point to open a similar center with the Hagerstown-Frederick area. We were also reminded that, for the Chancellor, distance learning extends from one meter to two million meters.

10. In the view of the Chancellor, the Legislative Taskforce is receiving quite diverse, sometime chaotic input, perhaps centering 95% funding, 4% on flexibility, and 1% on governance. With this and the MLE document, we need to find some position between "any institution, any program, any place, any time" and "avoidance of unneeded duplication".

11. T.J. indicated that she would get together with Steve Havas to try to complete the status report on shared governance, particularly in picking up pieces reported as missing in earlier meetings. She also indicated that work is still progressing with respect to the faculty development web page and that she will be getting together with Ken Baldwin on this tomorrow.

12. After a reconfirmation of our November agenda for the general CUSF meeting, as indicated above, the meeting was adjourned at about 1:00 p.m.

BILL CHAPIN

**DRAFT MINUTES
CUSF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
11-30-98**

The minutes of the previous Executive Committee meeting were distributed and corrected as well as draft minutes of the full CUSF meeting at Towson. Since our web site is now up and running, we agreed to work toward getting perfected versions of these and earlier minutes to Peter Lade at SSU. Given the typos in the current drafts and the need to go over the older minutes and perfect them (typos, syntax, etc) to the point that their posting will put CUSF in a good light, we agreed to go through this process from the most recent back, gradually filling the gaps.

Also distributed were the Chair's letter to the Chancellor concerning the Drug and Alcohol Policy, which occasioned much discussion about the closeness of the vote, and the possibility of changing the by-laws to require larger majority of major motions, a proposed revision of the Faculty Development Grants policy, and a proposed Shared Governance Policy document from the Faculty Affairs Committee. This last policy would provide specific criteria for measuring the state of governance on the campuses and will be a major agenda item for the general meeting in December. Review of the Regents' Awards Program continues. The Chair indicated that he is still working on putting together a suitable review committee for this year. There remain questions of the adequacy of the dollar amounts of the prizes, their apportionment between the two groups of campuses, and the newly proposed mentoring awards.

The proposed by-law change for the date for reapportioning CUSF representation will be put on the table at the December meeting and will be voted on in January. The responsibility for the reapportionment is with the Nominating Committee.. It is the intention of the committee (assuming that the by-laws change is approved) to have the proposed reapportionment done in time for appropriate action in the spring.

Most of the agenda for the December CUSF meeting was clear by this time: shared governance proposal, bylaws proposal on reapportionment, discussion of CUSF and faculty involvement in the budgetary process (follow up to Vivona talk), committee reports (ours and Pathways), perhaps K-16 and the work of Nancy Shapiro. Frank Kommenda will probably bring a legislative report during the January meeting. The meeting with the Senate Chairs is now fixed for January 29 with an agenda centering around shared governance and faculty salary questions.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT
CUSF Executive Committee Meeting
Minutes for January 11, 1999

The meeting was called to order shortly after ten a.m. The minutes of the previous meeting were eventually approved with a modification to reflect the fact that the date of the planned meeting with the Senate Chairs was changed (at a time after the previous Executive Committee meeting) to February 12.

Mission statements for the campuses are now in the process of being updated, so that they will be less restrictive, more general, perhaps shorter and perhaps reflecting a diminished role for MHEC. CUSF will need to monitor the level of faculty involvement in the writing of these statement on the various campuses, perhaps with the help of the Senate Chairs.

George Marx has sent the revised drug policy to the Attorney General with an accompanying letter reflecting CUSF's great concern with the self-reporting feature incorporated in view of the Governor's Executive Order. We will monitor the results. The Senate Chairs' meeting with the Executive Committee and the Chancellor, now scheduled for February 12, 1999, will include in its agenda shared governance, faculty salaries and faculty involvement in the budgetary process and the question of Senate representation on CUSF (?Chairs, Vice Chairs, Past Chairs?).

Chairman Larry Lasher had appointed members Baldwin, Lade, Walker, Collins and Zimmerman to the prize selection committee for this year. We need to get our own CUSF committees active in coming up with recommendations for suitable modifications of the current rules and processes for use in future years.

Richard McKenzie will invite Frank Komenda to the February general CUSF meeting to talk about the current activities of the Maryland Legislature, both those relating to the recommendations of the task force on the University System and to the current budgetary cycle.

The February general CUSF meeting will take place at UMBI, but we must determine which UMBI location so that we can inform the membership at the general meeting this Friday.

Chairman Larry Lasher has sent a letter to Acting President Holloway at Bowie State, inquiring about the shared governance difficulties there. [George Marx later reported that he

understood that the new faculty representative body there has indeed been approved by the campus.]

Chairman Larry Lasher distributed a draft of a proposed letter concerning the matter of the recognition of contact versus credit hours in faculty loads. The Executive Committee agreed to distribute a somewhat modified version of this letter at the Friday general CUSF meeting for discussion, particularly since the wishes and discussion of the general CUSF group at the December meeting were not quite clear to the Executive Committee.

George Marx and T. J. Bryan distributed copies of the task force report on the University System to the Executive Committee and will have copies for the entire body on Friday. It would appear that the accompanying cover document reflects an attempt at achieving more balanced

support for all the campuses than did the original document. [There will probably be legislative action as a result of this document. While the document supports keeping the system together, it would appear to require an extra \$25 million dollars in state support beyond that originally anticipated for the coming year. How to handle the included eighteen priorities if the funding is rather less will present challenges that CUSF must keep close tabs on.] Marx and Bryan also distributed copies of a University of Illinois policy on intellectual property, combining copyright and patent matter together, a style will may well be advocated here. This document will also be distributed to the full membership on Friday.

Discussion of the proposed shared governance document, referred back to committee at the general CUSF meeting in December, combined with a realization of the imperfect information obtained from the campus Presidents as a result of last year's shared governance inquiry led to a suggestion that a new survey be designed in consonance with the general principles of the Regents' document and the particular considerations of the proposal presented to CUSF in December. While recognizing that current trends may lead to more staff and student participation in shared governance and to lesser likelihood of more prescriptive centralized rules in this area, information from such a survey could inform UMSH of the current state of things and provide CUSF with strong, specific evidence for further recommendations.

The excellent web page now available for CUSF has led to questions concerning the position that a "webmaster" should occupy within CUSF (part of the secretarial duties?, Executive Committee member?, new position?) and to the suggestion that we determine the current usage of the web page. These matters were referred to the Administrative Affairs Committee.

Since we have heard little recently at CUSF in matters of teacher education and its relationship to K-16, it may be wise to invite Nancy Shapiro to speak at the general CUSF meeting in March, perhaps with a shorter prepared report and time to respond to member questions and concerns.

Bylaw questions, dealing with the handling of significant motions receiving close votes at general CUSF meeting, were referred to Administrative Affairs. The motion to change the bylaws so that we can readjust our representation levels from the various campuses at a time consonant with current election procedures should be presented at the Friday meeting. Chapin already has the current faculty counts from UMSH to facilitate the readjustment process.

BILL CHAPIN