

CUSF Executive Committee Meetings of 1999-2000

Draft minutes of all meetings **except** those held on **9/14/99** and **6/5/00**.

Draft Minutes

CUSF Executive Committee Meeting

August 23, 1999

The meeting was called to order at 10:00. Much of the meeting time was spent in getting schedules and listings in order. The following items discussed and adjusted at this meeting have been distributed separately:

- i. meeting schedule for CUSF for the 1999-2000 academic year;
- ii. mailing list of CUSF members and Senate Chairs;
- iii. committee assignments for the 1999-2000 academic year (including suggestions for Chairs and Co-chairs). John Collins will get information on the BOR committees on which our committees are supposedly patterned to see if this will assist in defining the duties of our committees.

The Nominations Committee will present a slate of candidates (probably Carl Smith and Peter Lade) at the September general CUSF meeting for the purpose of filling the vacant at-large place on the Executive committee.

The meeting of the CUSF Executive Committee, the Chancellor and the Senate Chairs is confirmed for October 8, at USMH. Shared governance, faculty salaries, unionization, K/16, strengthening of general education, are all topics that may well appear on the agenda that day, along with reports from the Chancellor, T.J. Bryan and Vice-Chancellor Middleton (plus additional topics suggested by the Senate Chairs themselves).

The planned CUSF orientation handout will include the materials already prepared by Larry Lasher, the constitution and the bylaws, and information about getting in touch with CUSF on the web (where much of the useful material on CUSF is already available). We need to encourage the presence of the Chancellor at our Executive Committee meetings (as witnessed by the suggestion of adding the word "Historically" before the corresponding statement in Larry Lasher's document).

The situation for the Shared Governance document has become more complex in view of the recent action of CUSS (coming after we contacted them at the suggestion of the Chancellor) in drafting a parallel document which raises for us questions concerning the nature of student, staff and faculty participation in shared governance. Given the particular faculty role in such areas as instruction/curriculum and the employment, promotion and tenure of faculty, and given the more preliminary nature of the current CUSS document, it seems wisest to move ahead as planned with our own document (with perhaps some minor modification of the introductory words to more clearly reflect our respect for the students and staff in the shared governance process).

Major topics for the new year include

- i. shared governance;
- ii. faculty salaries (where we need more complete and more consistent data);
- iii. distance education and the offering of upper-level courses/degrees at the community colleges and centers like Shady Grove;

- iv. unionization;
- v. the extended use of full-time lectureships (which, while reducing dependence on part-time faculty does not provide the stability of long-term tenure-track appointments for the departments);
- vi. the change in funding strategy for FY 2001 to a formula based on head-count and retention/ graduation rates; and
- vii. The work of the Pathways committees. We also considered inviting select members of the BOR, especially their new chair, to some of our general CUSF meetings (and also inviting the Chancellor on occasion).

In particular, the following items will probably appear on the agenda of the September general meeting:

- i. the orientation packet;
- ii. completion of CUSF committee assignments;
- iii. shared governance;
- iv. Pathways committees update (possibly by T.J. Bryan); v. faculty role in the budgetary process (at department, campus or CUSF level?)

Before adjourning, we agreed that it would be nice to request that the Chancellor send his usual letters of thanks out to faculty who had served last year on CUSF (copied to the department Chairs and the campus President).

**PRELIMINARY DRAFT MINUTES
CUSF Executive Committee Meeting
October 4, 1999**

Because of delays in earlier meetings in the morning, the Executive Committee Meeting started at several minutes after noon.

In addition to the already distributed proposed agenda for the meeting of the CUSF Executive Committee with the Senate Chairs on Friday, we agreed that some discussion of faculty involvement in the creation of mission statements would be appropriate. [Through a series of miscommunications and calendar difficulties, CUSF was left out of the process of creating the mission statement for the system. It would also seem to be the case that current campus mission statements have had very limited faculty input on some campuses.] {Later inquiry at the meeting with the Senate Chairs led to the conclusion that faculty were consulted in the matter of institutional mission statements on most campuses.}

Another item for the Friday calendar is the workload policy, recommended by the Pathways committee last year and adopted by the BOR. This allows more generous credit for non-lecture graduate courses, like research supervision, on the higher graduate levels and, consonant with current administrative policy, views the department (and not the individual faculty member) as the unit to be achieving sufficient average courseload each semester. Again, this switch seems to be going into effect in some places but not in all. The workload policy will also be on the agenda for the general CUSF meeting in Frostburg later this month.

Discussion of the current CUSF-supported shared governance document revealed both successes and difficulties. Steve Havas reported that, at a recent meeting with the campus Presidents, a certain amount of doubtfulness and hostility was expressed. It was not clear how

much of this was a sign of genuine concern and how much was desire to maintain the status quo which, according to last spring's surveying of the campuses, leaves something to be desired, particularly given the general lack of faculty participation in the budgetary process systemwide and other weaknesses in sharing particular to specific institutions. There is, however, some evidence that some of the Regents may be more sympathetic to the document than others. Regent Chapman will be attending our November meeting

The Chancellor, who is waiting for written reactions to the shared governance proposal, reported that he believes that the Presidents will find it too procedural and too prescriptive, too much 'one size fits all'. He said that most Regents policies indicate goals and directions and leave it up to the individual campuses as to how they will reach these goals, saying 'develop a campus policy that will cover X, Y, and Z' instead of 'here is the policy and procedures you must employ.' He also suggested that faculty would probably not be happy with such 'prescription from above' in other areas. He said that many Presidents may find the present BOR policy, perhaps with some small adjustments, more to their liking. He also observed that the document currently under discussion is really about faculty governance and does not include suitable consideration of staff and student participation in governance sharing and that it would be awkward and probably not wise to have one governance document coming to the regents from CUSF, one from CUSS, one from the students, etc. He did agree that there might be a 'piece missing' a forum from which a suitable such document might come.

Charles B. Lowry, a UMCP librarian and Chair of the system-wide library council, presented a report of the difficulty that the professional librarians are experiencing in the change of their status in the university system. These are the librarians with terminal Master of Library Science degrees, many of whom also have Ph.D's, not the general staff involved in shelving, manning the circulation desk, etc. . Prior to 1996, these employees were 'classified exempt' and had jobs that fit into the general classified employee system of position descriptions. Then, in 1996, they obtained a more appropriate system similar to the faculty system of ranks and tenure, but are now being deprived of this status. The Executive Committee was supportive of their maintenance of their more stable status, parallel to that of faculty, particularly after the Chancellor indicated that this was parallel to other special status, such as 'professor of the practice' and also indicated that there were no fiscal implications either way. Professor Lowry expressed willingness to come to a regular CUSF general meeting to present the position of the librarians.

Professor William Falk of UMCP was selected as Chair of the CUSF Legislative Committee.

The following items should appear on the agenda for the October general meeting in Frostburg on October 18:

1. Approval of the minutes from the previous meeting
2. Report of the Executive Committee;
3. The current status of shared governance;
4. Report from USM;
5. Update on the Board of Regents and discussion concerning the November CUSF meeting with its chair;
6. Circulating CUSF minutes to the BOR and to the Presidents;
7. Campus and USM mission statements;
8. Report on the meeting with the Senate Chairs;
9. Possible roles for USM faculty in reducing smoking in Maryland;

10. Meeting with representative of the librarians;
 11. Chair for the Legislative committee;
 12. Committee meeting and reports;
 13. Old Business;
 14. New Business;
 15. Adjournment.
-
-

DRAFT Minutes
CUSF ExCom Meeting
10-25-99

The meeting came to order at 10:05 with all members present except the Past Chair. Review of the Frostburg meeting revealed some disorder and disunity, a number of motions that seemed to get out of hand in the discussion, ending up taking time during which other matters should have been presented. We agreed to return to a more classical style of agenda, including approximate times for all items listed. All executive committee members will need to work diligently at the meetings to be sure that, while we remain flexible, we do not go totally off track, get ourselves bogged down in acrimonious discussion, in trying to revise the small wording of proposals in a committee of the whole style, or become more concerned about the 'sacredness' of wording that we have approved than about the goal that the wording would accomplish.

A preliminary agenda for the next meeting would include:

- Breakfast (9:30)
- Welcome and Greetings (10:00)
- Approval of the Minutes (10:10)
- Report from the Chair on Meetings attended (10:15)
- Report from the System (10:35)
- Presentation by Regent Chapman (11:00)
- Lunch and Committee Meetings (12:00)
- Committee Reports (1:00)
- Old and New Business (1:20)
- Adjournment (2:00)

Recent study of work done to retain and recruit top-notch faculty has revealed that the current benefits package available for USM faculty is much weaker than that offered by most comparable institutions. Donald Tynes reports that a proposal to raise the university contribution to retirement to 9.25% which, combined with a 2% faculty contribution will lead to an 11.25% overall contribution (currently 7.25%), will be presented to the appropriate legislative committee this November with hopes of having legislative approval for this for the next fiscal year. The dollars needed to cover this will come from general USM funds and not as a separate budgetary request. A matter to be dealt with separately in the question of the vesting of health insurance. Currently, those in the state retirement system have both spouse and eligible children vested after sixteen years, but those in TIAA/CREF and other external plans, vest the spouse only and only after twenty-five years. The hope is to bring some equity between the two groups of faculty eventually. [There is also a question of a proposed USM tuition remission benefit for employees of the Baltimore City Community College, but concern that demands for the spread of such

benefits to other systems could quickly make the system unworkable.]

Some discussion followed concerning the position of USMH and CUSF in view of Senate Bill 682 of last year, establishing the three-year window of greater local autonomy for the various campuses and their presidents. Thus at the same time that CUSF is starting to have wider participation (e.g., Martha Siegel will be attending the AAAC meetings and others will be attending BOR Educational Policy Committee, Financial Committee and Full Board meetings), the general trend would seem to be away from detailed and specific central control toward a position of general moral suasion and general policy-setting from the center and the determination of how general policy is to be realized residing with the individual campuses. This impacts our proposed Shared Governance document and its eventual acceptance, a matter already complex enough with the suggestions that we might have a Faculty Shared Governance document perhaps needing either parallel or integrated documents from CUSS and from the students.

Dr. Middleton presented a list of ten public policy issues for higher education (created by the Association of Governing Boards), indicating that these were issues likely to be of importance to USMH and so issues that we might well consider in our capacity as advisory to the Chancellor

1. Teacher Prep and the k-12 Relationship
2. Affordability vs. Access
3. Cost and Price of Higher Education
4. Implementation of Recent Federal Legislation
5. Federal Support for University Research
6. Diversity in Admissions
7. Information Technology and New Competition
8. Economic and Financial Trends
9. Creating a Sustainable Society and Future
10. Rethinking Public Higher Education Systems.

Some of our work and the work of the legislature last spring would seem to have addressed number ten; other work we have done would seem to address various others of these issues. The BOR is considering the question of determining competency standards for college graduates in areas of new technology: there is even a new Technology Committee of the BOR, dealing with both hardware questions and such matters as student "skill sets". The current work toward creating a State Plan for Higher Education, in which there is fortunately faculty representation, will also address some of these issues. The various CUSF committees will be assigned consideration of some of these areas at the next general meeting.

T. J. Bryan will be reporting at the next general CUSF meeting on the progress of the various Pathways committees, particularly the ART and IP committees. She also reported that information about nominations for the Faculty Awards has gone to the Senate Chairs, and that the Senate Chairs' list-serv is now up. We all agreed that there was considerable difficulty involved in keeping information posted on the web up to date, even simple things like current list of BOR members. Given the importance of Bill 682, we may try to both to have it up for viewing and to have Javier Mayeres come to a CUSF general meeting soon to give a presentation on its contents and implications.

Discussion followed of the conflict between the value of getting various CUSF minutes to external bodies such as the BOR in a timely way and the necessity of having a correct version of the minutes approved by the entire body before sending them to the outside world. For the ExCom minutes, we considered a process of having the minutes sent by e-mail to all members

with a deadline for corrections and then a deadline for e-mail approval of the adjusted minutes.

DRAFT MINUTES
CUSF Executive Committee Meeting
December 1, 1999

Present: Bill Chapin, John Collins, Steve Havas, Martha Siegel, Carl Smith; Charles Middleton

Since Vice Chancellor Middleton was available at the beginning of the meeting, he presented his report first. The adjustments suggested by CUSF for the improvement of the System Mission Statement were well received and will probably be included in the revised version to be made available in January. When the final version of the Statewide Overall Plan for Higher Education comes out on April 30, all campuses will have two months to submit revised mission statements according to the format to be determined by that Plan (presumably shorter and more succinct than many of the current statements). We should all be working to insure that our campuses start preparing for the writing of these statements now (and to insure that there is full faculty input) so that campuses do not have to rush through the process at a time when finals are going on and after that when many faculty are away. The System as a whole will be doing another version of their (non-required) mission statement at that time.

Concerning the CUSF Shared Governance statement, Dr. Middleton indicated that discussion at the AAAC might take place over two meetings (particularly because a number of Presidents might be unavailable for the December meeting). It is possible that the CUSS version might currently be favored as more inclusive, less prescriptive of methods for carrying our objectives (and so more appropriate to the currently mandated "institution-centric" version of USM, something we need to take into account when considering future directions for CUSF.)

After our endorsement in principle of the idea of librarians as a special class of non-tenure-track faculty, USM has gone ahead to work with the librarians on the details of a formal proposal (perhaps leading to a first document by the end of December). This work needs to be completed in time for the March BOR meeting.

Dr. Middleton also indicated that he would keep us up to date with the versions of the Statewide Plan for Higher Education and would do a presentation on this material at the January meeting with the Senate Chairs.

Reports followed from Executive Committee members attending meeting of other organizations to represent CUSF. Professor Smith reported that the BOR Finance Committee has discussed investment strategies, CUSS concerns about the exempt employee pay plan, dealing with the current liberalized procurement plans, five- versus ten-year capital improvement plans, and the difficulties of combined design and construction bids. The second meeting of this committee was conducted by telephone, the Chancellor participating.

Professor Siegel, who had attended the AAAC meeting, reported on discussion of the regional centers (and Senator Middleton's interest in them as sources of revenue) and the need to avoid "social engineering" in the selection of curriculum ("let's teach subject A in area N of the state because."), the recognition of the technology graduation requirement as a faculty and institutional issue, the beginning work of the recently-founded IP committee (with John Anderson as legal counsel), the work of the Graduate Research Council (the council of graduate deans), the

details of how faculty should be viewed who have administrative roles (e.g., deans), the State Plan for higher Education and how it impacts on teacher education and the encouragement of more and stronger primary and secondary school teachers for Maryland, and details of such matters as reporting crime statistics, being sure that suitable computer software packages are distributed equitably across the system, and the question of contact hours versus credit hours.

On the agenda for the next general meeting, beyond the standard required items (approval of minutes, old and new business, etc), we will include reports from the various internal committees and reports from the above-mentioned representatives to external committees, discussion by the Chancellor (perhaps a short introduction followed by a question period) in the hour before lunch, some discussion of the unified academic calendar and its relations to the nine- / nine-and-one-half month salary question, and discussion of the status of shared governance.

Our own discussion of shared governance at the end indicated flexibility about wording as long as principles were maintained and our willingness to deal with issues (e.g., in Recommendations #2, #4 and #8) where we might be able to concede a little to the particular situations of the campuses, still preserving our own document (instead of trying to write a compromise joint document with CUSS or other constituencies).

DRAFT MINUTES

CUSF Executive Committee Meeting

December 16, 1999 (for January 3, 2000)

[This meeting was held immediately after the December general CUSF meeting.]

The main concern of the meeting was the Shared Governance document and its reception at the January meeting of the campus Presidents. Professor Steve Havas indicated that it may be necessary to accommodate our document and the corresponding CUSS document to get support from the Presidents. Alternatively, it might be wise to incorporate our document (perhaps slightly adjusted) by reference into the current BOR document (perhaps also slightly adjusted). It would appear that there is agreement from CUSS that the incorporation of the AGB document by reference into the CUSS document is probably not appropriate. No general consensus was reached.

Both the work of the Pathways committees (IT and PT) and the committee developing the Statewide Plan for Higher Education will require constant attention during the time between now and the next general meeting in January.

For that meeting, agenda items include the status of the Shared Governance document, the status and contents of the Higher Education Plan, the usual annual report by Frank Komenda on the status of legislation of interest to the USM campuses, particularly budgetary matters, and the matters directed to committees for discussion at the December meeting. Many of the same matters, together with consideration of the common academic calendar, will also appear on the agenda of the Senate Chairs – ExecCom meeting on January 28.

DRAFT Minutes

CUSF Executive Committee Meeting

January 28, 2000

Present: Bill Chapin, John Collins, Steve Havas, Martha Siegel (visiting: Chancellor Langenburg)

The Executive Committee meeting began shortly after two at the conclusion of the meeting of the Executive Committee with the Faculty Senate Chairs.

Chancellor Langenburg confirmed that Professor Havas was indeed co-Chair of the shared governance committee headed by President Hoke of TU.

Since much of the next general CUSF meeting will be taken up by the presentations of the various union representatives, the only other special items to be added to the standard agenda are the progress of the legislature, the state of the State Plan for Higher Education, information concerning faculty workload, and the question of appropriate action concerning those members whose attendance has been sporadic. Some of these issues may appear as parts of regularly scheduled reports.

Instead of extending the scheduled meeting time of the general CUSF meetings, the Executive Committee decided first to try sending most of the materials currently distributed at the meetings in the packet that is mailed out ahead of time. If members are conscientious about reading the material before coming to the meeting, less of the meeting will be spent looking at material and hearing it reported on and more can be spent on discussion and action on items with which the members have already familiarized themselves.

Professor Chapin will send electronic copies of the minutes for the fall meetings to Professor Havas to send on to Professor Lade so that the CUSF webpage can be updated. Professor Havas also requested that minutes be briefer, with a two-page maximum when possible.

The Executive Committee began discussion of possible candidates for the election of officers in the spring and encouraged the Nominations Committee to become active in selecting candidates as early as possible.

The current confusion over multiple versions of The CUSF constitution will require checking with previous CUSF members and officers to try to determine how significantly different versions ended up on different web sites.

The current situation vis a vis faculty participation in collective bargaining requires clarification. We know of several documents that do not specifically forbid participation, but we do not yet know which document it is that contains this generally accepted prohibition. Chancellor Langenburg indicated that the governor will not be submitting a bill this year removing this bar to unionization but that there might be considerable support for any appropriate bill sponsored by others this year. He also indicated that CUSF or faculty participation in testimony before the legislature on most issues is often more ceremonial than efficacious. Depending on the way issues develop in the Legislature, Professor Falk of our Legislative Committee will need to consult with the Executive Committee to plan what Legislative Committee actions will be most beneficial this year.

The Chancellor also discussed the complex considerations involved in selection search committees for campus presidents.

DRAFT MINUTES
CUSF Executive Committee Meeting
February 28, 2000

The meeting began at 10:00 with a decision to leave the May and June Executive Committee meetings at the times scheduled, just moving to the other conference room, and recognizing that Dr. Havas might be a little late coming from the Chancellor's Council meetings scheduled these same days.

For the agenda for the next general meeting, beyond the standard agenda items, we agreed to include extensive discussion of the draft State Plan for Higher Education; a collective bargaining update; a report on the status of the Shared Governance document; nominations; and discussion of the legislative bill on the administration of academic centers such as Shady Grove. Given the fullness of the agenda, Dr. Havas will contact the two Board of Regents members with long-standing invitations to address the group and try to arrange for their presence at the April and May meetings.

Both UMCP and UMES need to elect replacement representatives to CUSF. The Senate Chairs at both institutions have been made aware of the problem. Study of the sheet of absences recently distributed to all the Senate Chairs reveals that virtually all CUSF representative have excellent attendance with the exception of one or two who rarely or never attend.

The bill introduced into the legislature (SB245) permitting collective bargaining for USM employees is actively opposed by CUSS (19-9 against) and its leader Larry Lauer. An update of the general collective bargaining situation by the time of the next general meeting is already included in the agenda above.

The committee set up to create a revised version of the Shared Governance document is proceeding well. Dr. Havas is working on revised wording to be presented to the Chancellor's Council on Monday. Current plans include the possibility of incorporating this document by reference into the Board of Regents document, but otherwise not making extensive changes in the current version of that BOR document.

We have reached the point of having a candidate for each CUSF office for the spring elections (Dr. Chapin, Chair; Dr. M. Siegel, Vice Chair; Dr. Collins, Secretary; Drs. Baldwin and Smith, at large). Under the current plan, we will close nominations for Chair at the March meeting and vote for that office at the April meeting, then close nominations for all the other offices at the April meeting and vote for those offices at the May meeting.

The new version of the State Plan for Higher Education seems to be quite unsatisfactory and is causing concern for the Chancellor, the USM central office, the campus Presidents, the AAAC, members of the Tydings committee, members of the Board of Regents, and others. It seems to be a prescription for Maryland Higher Education Commission control rather than a plan envisioning what needs to be done in higher education in the next ten years and what we might do to get there. Also worrisome is the apparent plan to change campus mission statements into plans specifying how particular activities will be carried out instead of statements indicating the goals and directions of each campus. Since the entire direction of the draft seems to be wrong, it is probably wiser not to attack it topic by topic but to look toward an alternate document, like the early draft that Javier Myares of the USM offices shared with us. Given the tight time constraints, Dr. Havas will work on a brief document expressing CUSF concerns and indicating that a more detailed response will be prepared and submitted later in the week after the general CUSF meeting at UMCP on March 14. A draft version of the letter will be prepared by Dr. Havas and circulated to the Executive committee for comments. [The official deadline for commentary on the draft State Plan is March 13.] Appropriate copies of these documents will go to MHEC, the presidents, the Chancellor, and the members of the Tydings committee. It is currently unclear

whether institutions of higher education outside the USM will buy into the current SBHE version of this state plan or not.

Dr. Bryan provided us with additional information the status of various documents, including the revision of IT planning document, the survey of campus policy on posthumous degrees, and the USM position on regional higher education centers (in view of the proposed legislation discussed above) and indicated that she would again be getting out her packet of relevant materials to CUSF members in time for reading before the next general meeting. [She distributed additional draft documents to Executive Committee members by e-mail shortly after the meeting.]

Dr. Smith initiated discussion of the letters of appreciation normally distributed to CUSF member by the Chancellor at the end of the academic year. Given the attendance situation discussed above, it should be easy to determine to whom the letters should be sent, although it probably will not be feasible to get the letters out in time to be of benefit in the current round of faculty evaluation for such matters as merit pay.

DRAFT MINUTES
CUSF Executive Committee Meeting
May 1, 2000

The meeting was called to order at 10:55 with all members present. Later, Drs. Langenburg and Middleton joined us.

Dr. Havas reported that the new draft for the Shared Governance document done by Dr. Middleton seemed satisfactory and also seemed to be well received by the Presidents at their meeting. The general opinion of the Executive Committee upon first reading the document was that the possible inclusions by reference of the AAUP and AGB statements were not necessary; all members are to get back to Dr. Havas tomorrow May 2, 2000, with the reactions after reading the new version more carefully. This version, if adopted, would become a Board of Regents policy document.

Concerning the resignation of Dr. Florestano from the State Board for Higher Education, Dr. Langenburg indicated that we probably could not become a source of direct faculty input into the process of selecting a successor, but might well indirectly provide input through the SBHE Faculty Advisory Council on which Dr. Havas sits.

The system-wide student council is quite interested in creating a published, publicly available version of student evaluation of faculty for each campus. We agreed to select two candidates at our next general CUSF meeting to work with the students on this to help assure that the general guidelines eventually created will lead to publications that are both informative and fair to all parties involved.

Dr. Havas announced that he had selected Dr. Brannigan, one of the two lawyers currently in CUSF, as our delegate to a system committee looking into the tenure termination process.

If the Chancellor is not available for the next general CUSF meeting, we agreed to invite Dr. Gertrude Eaton, the current administrator for the Shady Grove Center, to come and talk to us about the problems of the centers. [Later, Dr. Langenburg said that he would be available for the meeting, and requested that Dr. Havas send him an e-mail reminder.]

There was considerable discussion of faculty salary distribution, the 4% cost of living

adjustment and particularly the 2.5% merit monies, not all of which are distributed to the Department Chairs for merit distributions. There was general agreement that we needed more detailed salary information (inter-quartile ranges, for example) and that some formal explanation from the deans, vice-presidents, and presidents of the planned use of the withheld merit monies would be helpful in maintaining faculty confidence in the process.

The matters of faculty contract rules, rules for faculty assuming administrative positions, the State Plan for Higher Education, the Mission Statements due from campuses (now on October 30) all seemed worth of inclusion in the agenda of the next meeting.

Dr. Langenburg assured us that the retirement plan for TIAA/CREF faculty and the question of collective bargaining for USM employees, both parts of bills that did not pass in the legislature this year, are likely to be reconsidered next year, and so are items on which we might be proactive.

The question of who precisely are faculty and, in particular, which version of our constitution we should support, remains for further discussion. The most recent recommendation of our own committee is that we support the one currently on our web-site. However, this one is not consistent with the version on the BOR web-site and perhaps not consistent with other similar policies. This matter needs to be decided by CUSF as a whole.

The proposed calendar for next year was approved with minor modifications. It will be ready for general distribution shortly.

Dr. Langenburg reported that work is just beginning on the Strategic Plan for UMS (a plan which must be consistent with the above-mentioned State Plan) so that we will have opportunities for input even though the deadlines are somewhat short.

CUSF Executive Committee Meeting
DRAFT Minutes:
June 26, 2000

The meeting was called to order shortly after 12:15. All members were eventually present.

[Note that many of the items below will become action or discussion items for CUSF during the next academic year. More specific agenda planning will take place in early September.]

1. The University is considering the uniform calendar issue again. Although this uniformity is popular with the General Assembly (convenience for students taking courses at several campuses), it is possible that there will be some relaxation allowed in any new version of the plan.

2. Collective bargaining is an issue sure to reappear next year. We need to have a group of members interested in this issue (balanced in their views on the issue) ready to proceed. Experience last year with presentations by prospective unions was not as helpful as had been desired, nor was the introduction of various legislative bills on this matter without our input (especially since it was difficult for us to determine the exact intent of these bills even after they were introduced). USM will be preparing a white paper in this area.

3. The question of the work of the Part -Time and NonTenure-Track "Pathways" successor committee left both the AAAC and CUSF with concerns. There seems to be strong support for

the principle of improving the position of these employees, but some general agreement that the version proposed does too much micro-managing and does not distinguish sufficiently between long-term employees and those hired at the last minute to fill a special teaching need. A new version of the proposals will probably be available to us in the fall.

4. Dr. Havas and Dr. Bryan will arrange for appropriate letters to be sent from USM to CUSF representatives and their supervisors, thanking them for work done for CUSF this year.

Questions remain about how often this should be done (annually, once every three years?)

5. Dr. Havas will respond to the UMCP Senate indicating strongly that emeritus faculty would not be suitable choices for CUSF representatives.

6. Dr. Havas will report to the Board of Regents that consideration should be given to having the recycling of waste material as a general policy for all campuses in the system.

7. The question of suitable titles for faculty who are not tenured but who serve at the pleasure of the administration at UMUC (and perhaps other institutions) remains unresolved. It is clear that "university professor", etc., will not do, nor the use of the ordinary "assistant professor", etc., sequence of titles for non-tenured faculty. Use of the term "affiliated" has been suggested.

8. There is legislative concern that core-faculty have produced a slightly smaller percentage of credit hours generated than in the past, despite increased fiscal support, something to which USM needs to respond by December 1. Solutions involving the expansion of the meaning of core faculty beyond the tenure track are problematic both because legislators might well consider them to be reporting trickery and because of general concerns about the recognition of the essential role of core faculty especially at times of expanding off-campus centers and other forms of distance education.

9. The decision of USM to meet the legislatively mandated deadline for the creation of the system strategic plan despite the late work of the SBHE and the ensuing short turn-around times for comments (particularly since earlier faculty participation in the creation of the plan seems to have been virtually nil) raised concern. Since there was little CUSF response to the previous one-day deadline for comment, Dr. Havas encouraged the members of the Executive Committee to look carefully at the newest version of the plan to be made available by Dr. Bryan and to get comments, if any, back to him.

10. Dr. Havas had prepared a letter asking for more specific and useful data for faculty salary analyses. He asked that we all send him input and suggestions. [Later, Dr. Siegel sent comments covering the main concerns and suggestions expressed during Executive Committee discussion.]

11. The perception that faculty grievance procedures are not working effectively on some campuses will need further consideration. Many faculty seem hesitant to use the procedure at all lest the filing of a grievance damage their future relationships with colleagues and with the University. Others find that the procedures work better on paper than in practice or are concerned about what to do when the end of the process at the President's office seems to be unsatisfactory. The appeal procedure to the Board of Regents is not clear. It may be necessary to

separate the "Termination for Cause" procedures out into a separate formal policy to clarify some of the details.

12. The Shared Governance Policy will go to the Board of Regents in July, perhaps with no attempts at last-minute adjustments by those who had opposed work in this direction in votes at earlier levels. Appropriate ways of monitoring conformance with this policy still need considerable consideration on our part.