

CUSF Executive Committee - Senate Chair Meetings of 1999-2000

Draft minutes of all three meetings.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

CUSF ExCom – Senate Chairs Meeting Minutes

October 8, 1999, 10 A.M to 2 P.M.

Present: Linda Baker (UMBC), T. J. Bryan (USMH), Bill Chapin(CUSF), John Collins (CUSF), Eric Easton (UB), Steve Havas (CUSF), Norma Holter (TU), Peter Lade (SSU), Donald N. Langenberg (USMH), Larry Lasher (CUSF), Joseph McLaughlin (UMB), Charles Middleton (USMH), John O'Rorke (FSU), Thaddaus Phillips (CSC), Marvin Reitz (UMBI), Martha Siegel (CUSF), Carl Smith (CUSF), William Walter (UMCP), David Wright (UMCES-CBL)

After introductions of all present and distribution of a packet of relevant documents to all present, discussion centered on topics likely to be of importance and of common interest this year.

Status of Shared Governance: Steve Havas indicated that the presentation of this document in its current form to the campus presidents did not result in uniformly favorable replies. There was concern expressed about the actual meaning of such phrases as “ significant administrative decisions”, questions of who actually represents the faculty, questions of the appropriateness of such a proscriptive document in an era when authority is devolving from the center to the campuses, views of the document as too much ‘one size fits all”, etc. Chancellor Langenburg later indicated that he is waiting for written reaction from the campus presidents. He feels that many of them would prefer the present policy, perhaps with some tweaking, that the proposed document may be too procedural, that it can be seen as representing faculty governance and so might be rewritten to reflect the student and the staff, that a better means of solving particular problems at particular institutions may be to bring them to his attention for action (some group discussion as to whether this has been successful in the past), that he considers the idea of a campus-by-campus “report card” on shared governance to be acceptable, etc. He also indicated that it might well happen that some mandate might come from the Board of Regents for a general education requirement in technology competence for all students, thus having the BOR share in the area of curriculum development (a traditional area of faculty control and oversight), that while the BOR is seeking funding increases in the neighborhood of 11% per annum for the next few years (something that would help us get to the desired 85 percentile in #2 below), there is a correspondent BOR expectation of demonstrable improvement in teaching, faculty eminence, etc. In general, he indicated that the BOR tends to set goals and have the campuses come up with suitable means for accomplishing these goals in their own particular circumstances.

Faculty Salaries and Retirement Benefits: [Some of the material relevant here was inadvertently omitted from the packets and distributed later in the meeting.] The situation would seem to be that we are falling behind the desired “85 percentile of peers” less quickly than previously, that most progress is in the lower faculty ranks, leading to

even more salary compression at the higher end. It was noted that there is complication with our various ten month and nine and a half month contracts (compared to nine month contracts elsewhere) in recruitment and in obtaining adequate summer support for faculty. There is also concern that faculty are not much involved in budgetary processes. Furthermore, it is rather more difficult politically to get dollars for 'faculty raises' than it is to get dollars for 'recruitment and retention of faculty of eminence' or for 'merit increases' for small numbers of superstars.

Unionization of Faculty: There will be speakers from several unions at one of the CUSF meetings; faculty willingness to hear input is clearer than general faculty interest in unionization; the system staff group has come out against unionization.

Pathways and its Committees: T. J. Bryan reported on this. She indicated that, of the original committees set up to deal with the eight Pathways propositions, the Workload Committee has completed its job, resulting in a new policy discussed in #7 below. The Intellectual Property Committee has recommended that the corresponding BOR-established committee be brought into activity to come up with a single unified policy for all matters in this area. The ART and PT committees have come together to form one committee since many matters in the two areas seemed to overlap; a report may be ready by January 2000. Detailed reports appear in the folders. P. J. Bryan will continue to keep everyone informed on the activities of these committees this year.

K-16: Martha Siegel is virtually the only faculty representative in the current working group. The performance goals, distributed in the packet may change both what we can expect of our freshmen and what we must teach prospective teachers, thus becoming a concern for all general education courses and not just for teacher education departments. The new Praxis examinations for prospective teachers, with a heavier concentration of actual content knowledge, are critical for all since some federal funding is tied to institutional success with these exams.

Librarians: The professional librarians on the various campuses who just a few years ago obtained a faculty-type promotion system are now in danger of losing this; general sentiment was in favor of supporting their continuation in the faculty-like status. Job security issues were cited as well.

Workload Policy: The newly adopted policy requires slightly smaller, more realistic numbers of students in higher level graduate courses like thesis research. It also allows campuses to give extra recognition in the course load for activities such as advising large numbers of students, working on cooperative courses, courses with larger contact hours than credit hours, but leaves this at the discretion of the campuses individually. Significantly, the policy also changes the focus of workload from the individual to the department, allowing for individual divergence in assignments so long as departmental averages are met. The Chancellor agreed to discuss this change with the presidents again, since it seems not to be recognized in some areas on some campuses. This diversification allowance in this policy does not extend to the question of the percentage division between teaching, research, service, etc. expected of individual faculty. More

flexibility may also be needed to better serve the needs of the comprehensive institutions.

Other important items and dates:

1. The Chairs Workshop will take place on October 29 at UMBC. President Hrabowski and several of the provosts will speak.
2. The System Mission Statement has been constructed (with CUSF left out of the loop by oversight and some scheduling problems). The administration has undertaken to avoid such oversight in the future.
3. Because of the changes taking place in overall governance structure, the campuses are completing one set of Mission Statement approvals but will need to do another set very shortly after the MHEC statewide plan for higher education in Maryland appears on next April 30. This plan, the first parts of which are being discussed in focus groups now, covers not just USM but all the higher education institutions in Maryland.
4. Efforts in the education of students and the public in general about the negative aspects of tobacco smoking might well be encouraged on all campuses, both in view of the health risks involved and in view of the potential availability of funds from the tobacco litigation settlement.
5. The recommendations for Regents Faculty Awards should be coming in from the Presidents of the campuses. It is important to assure that faculty are involved in the selection process.
6. Faculty Development Awards will again be available this year. While relatively small in dollar amount, these awards can provide some start-up money for collaborative development tasks, development of expertise for web courses, etc.

Before adjournment a little before two p.m., the group agreed that two meetings next semester, one in late January and one toward the end of the semester might be worthwhile. Senate Chairs were asked to contribute to on-line discussion in the interim. A list-serve will be set up for this purpose.

Draft Minutes
CUSF Executive Committee / Senate Chairs Meeting
January 28, 2000

Present: CUSF ExCom: Bill Chapin, John Collins, Steve Havas, Martha Siegel; Campus Senate Chairs: Linda Baker (UMBC), Eric Easton (UB), Jack Fruchtman (TU), John Organ, Jr. (BSU), William Walters (UMCP); USM Offices: T. J. Bryan, Charles Middleton.

Professor Havas requested that appropriate nominations materials for the new MHEC FAC positions, one for a part-time faculty member and one for a full-time non-tenure-track faculty member, be sent to him. The terms for these two representatives will end June 30 of this year. Three other new representatives will come from outside the USM.

Vice Chancellor Middleton reported that the first draft of the State Plan for Higher

Education went to the Tydings committee on schedule but will require redrafting, perhaps in leaner, more directive language and in a style more centered on accountability and outcomes, and is now scheduled for draft release on the web perhaps as early as the end of the first week of February. The final version still must be completed by April 30th with the corresponding campus mission statements due June 30th. Faculty on all campuses would be wise to get involved in the creation of these statements soon, using the current (not yet officially approved) version of the new format as a guide but also indicating how the mission is consistent with the State Plan.

The newly approved document on low productivity programs, emphasizing degree production as the major numerical measure, was distributed.

As more regional centers like Shady Grove and the new campus in Hagerstown develop, we must decide how they fit into the USM, particularly as they pass from evening classes to full daytime use, offering degree programs from other campuses.

The Technical Fluency Resolution approved by the BOR Ed Policy committee deals both with access and with expected student knowledge, leaving the implementation details to the faculty on the campuses. We should share these plans with each other as they develop.

T. J. Bryan distributed materials on i. faculty grants competitions (including deadlines); ii. the Regents Faculty Awards (details on the process recently concluded; some questioning of the required essay and some concern for campuses from which the president made no recommendations this year); iii. the work on revising the ART document to include librarians within faculty ranks; iv. a best practices report on the appointment of faculty with administrative responsibilities; v. the minutes and the list of members for the IP committee (to conclude their work by December 2000).

Professor Havas instituted a discussion of student evaluation of teaching, based on concerns expressed by the head of the system student council. How evaluation is done and how it is made available would seem to differ from campus to campus. Particular concern arises from the use of faculty whose native language is not American English.

While CUSF will be hearing from various union representatives at its next general meeting (although faculty are not currently eligible to participate in collective bargaining), it would appear that CUSS (the corresponding staff group) although eligible to participate, is opposed to unionization.

Discussion of problems with the Common Calendar included the difficulties of commencements near Christmas, the need for longer freshman orientation, and the desire of some to have the short term in May rather than in January.

The conflicts between open process and the need to preserve confidentiality (to assure the availability of strong candidates) in presidential searches led further discussion of the methods of selecting the corresponding search committees.

The group agreed to meet again during the first two weeks in May, once a suitable date can be found.

DRAFT Minutes
CUSF Executive Committee / Faculty Senate Chairs
May 10, 2000 Meeting

Present: From the campuses: Linda Baker UMBC, Bill Chapin UMES/CUSF, John Collins UMBI/CUSF, Eric Easton UB, Jack Fruchtman TU, Steve Havas UMB/CUSF, Peter Lade SSU, Mark Leone UMCP, Joseph McLaughlin UMB, Rolane Murray CSC, John O'Rorke FSU, Martha Siegel TU/CUSF (presider), Carl Smith UMCP/CUSF, William Walters UMCP. From the University of Maryland System offices: T. J. Bryan, Gertrude Eaton, Don Langenberg, Charles Middleton

The meeting was called to order at 10:05, at which time all present introduced themselves.

The new campus mission statements are due in to the USM offices in September so that all appropriate adjustments can be made in time to submit them to MHEC by October. The new format seems to be a strategic plan for the next few years, rather than a traditional mission statement. Any campus faculty that have not already gotten busy helping to write these statements should start now to prepare for this legislative/MHEC mandate since many faculty will not be available in summer months.

The mandated reporting of low-productivity programs has taken place. All present received copies of the campus-by-campus listing. This year, campuses have the chance to write justifications for the long-term preservation of small programs and also are allowed a small number of "wild cards" to permit the preservation of a few programs without providing the normal justification. This should greatly decrease the number of programs to be considered in future years. Faculty participation in this process would appear to have been minimal on most campuses. Some listings on the current sheet are incorrect and will be removed

The current version of the shared governance document, revised and adjusted by Dr. Middleton, seems to be getting a good reception by the Presidents and may be voted on at one of their June meetings.

Dr. Gertrude Eaton, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Director of the Shady Grove Center, described the growth of this Center from a primarily weekend/evening center for specialized graduate programs into a center that will offer Junior/Senior-level undergraduate programs to meet the needs of Montgomery County students and particularly A. A. graduates of Montgomery College. Starting this fall, other USM campuses will be offering such programs in areas like business, information sciences, computer science, and various health care fields. The student will be considered as students of the offering campuses, will pay the tuition rate of those

campuses and receive their degrees from those campuses. The rule requiring that sixty percent of credit-hour generation come from full-time faculty will be in place (including full-time Montgomery College faculty who happen to be qualified to teach for the programs involved). A third building for the Center is anticipated by 2004.

Organizing a center of this sort (which is not a campus) leads to many complications: insuring on-side advising and other normal student service functions; enticing faculty to make the regular trip to Shady Grove (since using the center as a distance-delivery site is not desired by the community) via extra pay or reduced loads at the home institution; managing to cover the courses by campuses / departments whose at-home needs are not being met because of inadequate monies or insufficient faculty; assuring that appropriate accreditation standards can be met in this new environment. Recently-passed legislation would extend the center model to the rest of the state. The Hagerstown Center may well be developed on the basis of the current experience at Shady Grove.

Chancellor Langenberg reported that work on the 2002 budget plan is underway. Work on the System Strategic Plan, carried out by an all-campus group, is proceeding on a schedule allowing delivery by the mandated date. There will be included two-page white papers on at least fifteen issues, including the price of education, dealing with the new student mix, dealing with diversity, reaching the end of the post-baby boom, enrollment management, technology, minority access, faculty/staff development, imaginative undergraduate programs, workforce shortages (teaching, information technology, health care), digital libraries, etc. This plan will be available on the Web. The Chancellor also promised that the Optional Retirement Plan legislation that failed this year will be submitted again next year, adjusted as necessary to assure passage. This legislation is critical in making USM competitive in hiring, especially in high-demand fields.

Dr. Middleton expressed satisfaction that the new version of the missions statements avoids the “if you don’t list a program, you can’t ever have it” and the “everything in miniscule detail” syndromes, and stresses conceptual breadth instead of prescription of micro-managed detail. The new State Plan should be up on the web by tomorrow, with all the detailed strategies moved to an appendix. Campus statements need to be consistent with this document, but no one campus needs deal with everything mentioned.

CUSF voted this spring in favor of the principle that faculty should be allowed to have the right to choose or reject collective bargaining. Both CUSF and a number of the campuses have had union representatives give presentations. CUSF will continue its study of this are during the next academic year, probably via a special committee, particularly because of the confusion surrounding the failed collective bargaining bills in the legislature this year and their linkage to the failed retirement bill. Questions of appropriate bargaining unit size (USM, campus, college, separate or non-separate graduate students) seem to complicate this matter even further.

T. J. Bryan presented the new faculty contract document as an information item. It is written to provide a general framework to remove the 9.5/10/12-month contract

difficulties and confusion and to allow suitable local campus management of these issues. It may lead to more suitable policy on summer salary and summer benefits (especially retirement contributions). Similarly, the policy on faculty with administrative roles is intended to clarify this poorly defined situation and to ensure that all the details are spelled out in writing in advance of such appointments.

After lunch, we discussed the current draft of the Intellectual Property Policy, one that has received good feedback from the campuses. Further suggestions should be sent to Drs. Fruchtman and Lade. Electronic publishing, professional notetakers and distance-learning courses all complicate matter even further in this area.

A major concern both for CUSF and the campuses is the determination of exactly who the faculty electorate is (Who votes to elect CUSF members? Who may be elected? Who votes on what issues in Departmental meetings?) While final resolution of such matters is like to take place on a campus-by-campus basis, general questions arise: Where do full-time non-tenured people fit in? Part-time tenured people? Part-time non-tenured people and graduate students who teach? Special groups like Professors of the Practice? Siegel asked that the Senate Chairs post their campus definition of the faculty electorate on the Senate Chairs discussion list.

The CUSF officers for the 2000-2001 academic year will be Bill Chapin Chair, Martha Siegel Vice Chair, John Collins Secretary, Carl Smith At Large, Kenneth Baldwin At Large, and Steve Havas Past Chair.

Following a brief discussion of the schedule for next year's CUSF / Senate Chairs meeting, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30.