CUSF Executive Committee Meeting
Minutes

October 3, 2012

In Attendance were: Jay Zimmerman, Virletta Bryant, Robert Kauffman (phone), Nagaraj Neerchal, Bobbie Adams, and Joyce Shirazi (phone).

CONVENING THE MEETING

The ExecCom October 3rd meeting was convened by Jay Zimmerman at 12:15 PM in the downstair's conference room at System headquarters in Adelphi, Maryland.

WORKLOAD REPORT

At the request of the General Body, the ExecCom welcomed Ben Passmore , Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, to brief ExecCom on the workload reports. The purpose of his attendance was: (1) to provide an overview of the faculty workload report, (2) to address questions regarding Coppin (some of their metrics are outside the norm), and (3) to provide suggestions regarding how CUSF can utilize the workload report in their review process. The following is a summary of the discussion (see also attachments: The Eighteenth Annual Report on the Instructional Workload of the USM Faculty).

- The workload report is required by the Regents although it originates with the Legislature and the Department of Budget and Management. Its purpose is to measure workload productivity within campuses over time and between campuses. It tends to be a better measure of changes within campuses because there can be significant factors that affect workload calculations. Therefore, the primary purpose of the workload report is to satisfy the Legislature's need to know that productivity of the System is satisfactory. Anything done with workload and workload reports need to be framed in terms of this function.

- In response to a question, Ben outlined the general process involved in the workload report. The workload reports from the individual campuses go to Ben's office where he compiles the results. Institutional summaries are provided to the Regents. Institutional internals aren't. In addition, he reviews the internals and if there are significant anomalies, he brings these to the attention of the Provost at the institution. In summary, the process reinforces the conclusion that the workload issues are solved at the campus level.

- Ben noted that the workload report could be used as a management tool within the system. However, he expressed caution and that it would require a step by step process to allow for the individual differences on campuses. It would need to be an evolutionary process.

- There was a discussion regarding how workload is calculated and how it can be modified to the advantage of the institution. If the administration needs to increase workload for the workload, they can count independent studies, field experiences, internships, other incidental courses, and research as part of workload (assuming that they aren't already counted). If they need to decrease workload, then the administration would tend to discount or not count these items as workload.

In addition, they can increase workload by counting any and all administrative responsibilities including coordinating programs and sub-programs, accreditation functions, program reviews, and other administrative functions.

- Ben noted that workload is a balancing act, and why it is more of a "gross tool" rather than a precision instrument. The upper and lower limits may indicate workload problems. However, there may be extenuating reasons why the workload is at the limits. These reasons may be ephemeral or they may be systemic and an indication that there is a problem. He suggested that this is why it is important to approach the workload issue at the institutional level.

- Ben acknowledged that by playing with the factors that calculate workload, faculty abuse could result where output is maximized while the workload is seemingly within limits. However, Ben noted that the purpose of workload is to optimize productivity, not maximize it. Maximization can lead to students being harmed, faculty burnout, and faculty leaving the System institutions. The result is that excessive workload can make the System less competitive. In this respect workload becomes a balancing act to optimize productivity, student satisfaction, and faculty output.

- Regarding Coppin's workload, there may not be any indication that they are out of line with everyone else. Accreditation tends to affect workload because faculty are reassigned to accreditation rather than teaching. Also, the business school has been pulled out of the workload report. Ben noted that historically Coppin has had a workload at the upper limits. Traditionally, the process has been one of alerting the campus in question and letting them to work toward a solution. This is consistent with delegating management of the institution at the institutional level. Ben indicated that this could be an issue that shared governance and the faculty at Coppin could address with their administration. In summary, System leaves the specifics of solving workload problems to the individual campuses.

Ben provided a summary and the ways that he sees CUSF involving itself with faculty workload. First, the workload report can be used as a diagnostic tool to see if action needs to be taken. This is the way other state agencies use the data. Second, he raised the question whether the workload instrument is serving the faculty from a faculty perspective and suggested that this might be a focus for CUSF. Based on the discussion, caution needs to be emphasized here on both points because using the workload report for a different use than its original purpose can easily have unintentional consequences that are not desirable for faculty. Third, Ben questioned the value of CUSF using the workload report as an interagency evaluation tool where comparisons could be made across campuses. He noted that the workload report has not been really a good instrument for this purpose.

Regarding the next step and what should be done, there was general consensus to proceed with caution because of the unintentional consequences of using an instrument designed to provide the Regents and the Legislature with data on productivity differently than its original intent. Second, this topic should be brought up at the Chair's meeting to determine if workload is an issue on other campuses. Third, regarding Coppin, the general consensus was that the faculty should work with their President in this issue in conjunction with Joann's office. Fourth, the UMUC issue was raised. Ben noted that UMUC along with several other schools where there are a large number of adjunct faculty have been excluded from the workload report. This is because the workload report was a report of full-time faculty workload, and they were excluded because they didn't fit the parameters of the report. Fifth, it was suggested that ExecCom continue to work with and pursue this issue with Joann and her office.

In summary, Ben noted that CUSF was on the right track. Faculty need to work at the institutional level in addressing workload issues. And if there are problems, CUSF and the individual campuses need to

work with Joann and her office to seek remedy.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

A motion was made, second, and the September 4th minutes were approved.

BUSINESS

Chancellor's Council. Jay provided the group a brief overview of the Chancellor's Council which met at Ft. Meade. Topics discussed include: academic transformation, Empowering UMB and UMCP, Ft. Meade, and a bus tour of the facility. Academic transformation includes the host of new educational approaches to increase the efficiency of education while at the same time increase learning and student involvement.

Tabled Motion 1212: At the May 18th meeting Motion 1212 was tabled and returned to the Faculty Rights committee. Since the motion had not been acted upon, Jay was interested in what ExecCom recommended doing with the motion. It was decided to bring up the item, to indicate what is currently being done, to indicate that the intent of the motion is being fulfilled, and to recommend leaving the motion tabled.

> **Motion #1212: Senate Chairs Annual Shared Governance Review [from May 18, 2012 minutes]:** Be it resolved: In order to further shared governance at individual institutions within the USM, the Council of University System Faculty recommends that the chairperson of the faculty governance body at each institution prepare a yearly report on the status of shared governance at their institution which will be sent to the Chair of CUSF. A compiled report approved by the CUSF Executive Committee will be shared with the Chancellor, CUSF General Body, and the Senate Chairs. [Disposition: Tabled]

October 11th Meeting: The upcoming meeting at Frostburg was discussed. Robert updated the group on the logistics including the phone.

Senate Chairs Meeting: The Senate Chairs meeting is scheduled for December 14th. There is a logistics issue since the Chancellor's Conference room is not currently available.

NEW BUSINESS AND ADJOURNMENT

There was no new business and with additional business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert B. Kauffman

Robert B. Kauffman
Secretary, CUSF

Attachments: The Eighteenth Annual Report on the Instructional Workload of the USM Faculty