

CUSF General Meetings, 1989-1998

This file contains all available minutes of CUSF general meetings from the founding of CUSF through the 1997-1998 academic year. The earliest available minutes are for April 12, 1994. Many other minutes through 1998 are missing.

University of Maryland System Council of the University System Faculty (CUSF) Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, April 12, 1994 Coppin State University

Present: Fox, SSU, Chair; Alexander, UMCP; Bambacus, FSU; Block, UMCP (voting alternate); Brizzolara, TSU; Bowles, BSU; Chichester, CSC; Cohen, UMCP; Friedman, TSU; Gill, UMBC; Goldman, UMAB; Guilford, BSU; Hess-Vait, UMBC; Jagus, UMBI (voting alternate); Johnson, SSU; Lasher, UMBC; McMahan, TSU; Moore, CSU (alternate); Pergerson, CES-UMCP; Rebach, UMES; Schukoske, UB; Sternheim, UMCP; Tits, UMCP; Turner, UMCP; Wallinger, FSU.

Guests: Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA, George Marx, UMSA; Prof. Carola Hibschan, CSU senator.

Absent: Arnold, UMAB; Brianas, UMUC; Fletcher, UMBI; Hunt, UMCP; Luchsinger, UB; Talley, UMES; Varghese, UMAB; Wright, CEES.

The meeting was called to order at 10:08 a.m.

I. Welcome: President Calvin Burnett welcomed the Council to CSU and urged more academics to run for public office to share their expertise with the legislature. Faculty Senate Secretary Ameni Courts welcomed the CUSF and encouraged its direction. The Chair thanked Myra Chichester for arranging the meeting at CSU.

II. Approval of March minutes: Corrections were submitted (in Section VI., add "of" before "Vice" on line 1, and revise VIII.B. to read "the following TC by-laws provisions be endorsed:"). Motion was made and seconded that the minutes be approved as amended. Motion carried.

III. Report of the Vice Chancellor: Vice Chancellor Marx reported on faculty workload, which will be discussed at the Chancellor's Council on May 2:

UMS Faculty Workload Policy dated April 8, 1994: The revised draft was distributed. The policy is due to the legislature on December 1.

Coordination of response: Motion made by Larry Lasher to collect input from campuses by April 25 and formulate a position at the May 11 CUSF meeting. Motion seconded and carried.

* CUSF Educational Policy Committee members are to provide input to Larry Lasher by April 25.

Re. legislative concerns, Vice Chancellor Marx shared two points: (1) the BOR has assured the legislature it will set parameters for UMS; (2) the policy contains numbers to provide assurances; it is unlikely that the section on quantification of instruction will be removed. The Vice Chancellor said that the numbers portray the status quo, and that citizens are concerned nationally for affordable education for our children.

Comments were made that the percentage of effort for research institutions should be 45% instruction (4 - 5 courses); that post-tenure review is casually written in the the policy. It reads, "Further, it is expected that each institution will develop procedures for the systematic review of each faculty member and establish consequences for failure to fulfill expectations." See page 2 of April 8 draft, second to the last sentence.

A question was raised about the exemption of the professional schools. Vice Chancellor Marx responded that accrediting standards affect faculty workload in these schools, and that the standards will be left to the institutions to develop in keeping with those standards.

It was suggested that class hours be counted rather than credit hours, so that sciences and performing/visual arts faculty. See Section V.1. which includes "discipline" as a factor to be considered in making exceptions from the standard instructional load.

Vice Chancellor Marx said that institutions have not collectively addressed the problem of faculty who do not produce, and that while the numbers of individuals involved are small, the policy is designed to have consequences flow to non-productive faculty.

A comment was made about the time-consuming nature of clinical training, e.g., in psychology and nursing.

Comment was made that this policy will drive away individuals who work on a magnum opus, a work of a lifetime.

Comment was made that some faculty work with some graduate students who are not registered for credit. The response was that the legislature is concerned with undergraduate instruction and is interested in tracking state resources (faculty time) into that work or documenting exceptions from that.

* Formal written responses from the campuses should be sent to Larry Lasher by April 25.

* Redistribution of Vision II monies: Announcements will be made in the near future.

IV. Old Business:

A. Shared Governance Principles: Motion was made and seconded to endorse the draft of April 6. The principles would be sent to the Chancellor, the Board of Regents, and the campus Senate chairs. CUSF would ask that the Chancellor ask the presidents to comply with the principles on their campuses.

Andre Tits made a motion to amend paragraph 1 to read "is important" rather than "is a necessary condition". Motion was seconded, and motion failed.

Comment was made that shared governance should include a voting voice in institutional decisions, that UMS could require more than a consultative role for faculty. John Bambacus responded that the law does not give faculty a decision-making role.

Motion to endorse the principles carried, with one in opposition, one abstention.

Motion was made that the CUSF send to the Chancellor, to be forwarded to the BOR. Motion was seconded, motion carried, with one in opposition.

Motion was made by Larry Lasher that the CUSF direct the Executive Committee to conduct a study of the state of shared governance on the campuses according to the Principles of Shared Governance as approved, and that a report back to the CUSF be made by the December, 1994 CUSF meeting. Motion was seconded by Joel Cohen. Motion carried unanimously.

B. Legislative Committee report: Joel Cohen reported for the Committee:

Faculty Regent Bill: The Senate committee voted in favor of the bill 10-1. The bill died on the floor at second reading, 22-24 because of Faculty Guild (as opposed to CUSF) opposition. Larry Lasher commended Joel Cohen on behalf of the Council for his work on the bill.

Faculty Workload meeting with the legislature: A written report will be sent.

Management Flexibility bill: This has been held over for summer study. The management flexibility bill for Morgan State passed; but that bill brought Morgan up to the same status that UMS has.

Audit bill: There was a proposal to audit the educational foundations, to see what corporations give. The bill passed the Senate. The action in the House was not known.

Faculty salaries: 3% COLA, \$800 minimum; merit raises will start on September 1.

C. Education Policy Committee meeting: The proposal in Vision II that UMAB would be in charge of coordination of the three nursing programs was voted down in committee.

Resolution on part-time faculty: The draft is being reworked as a policy.

D. Open Meetings Law: This item was deferred to the May meeting.

E. Telecommunications Council (TC): James Alexander reported on the April 8 meeting, and distributed the agenda. Two of the four CUSF representatives have attended; they are from SSU and UMCP.

* Persons interested in serving on the TC should contact Kathy Fox for possible appointment as alternates. Cheryl Moore indicated that she would like to be an alternate.

V. New Business:

A. Optional Retirement Plans: Norman Johnson, SSU, and Steve Isberg, UB, are reviewing additional retirement plan options for faculty. The criteria used for recommendations are sound investment options and options not presently available under TIAA-CREF.

B. Nominating Committee: Elections were held for the 1994-95 executive committee and those elected were M.J. McMahon, President, Larry Lasher, Vice President, Jane Schukoske, Secretary, Virginia Guilford, Member-at-large, and Joel Cohen, Member-at-large. Thanks were extended to the Nominating Committee (Brizzolara, Chichester and Gill) for its work.

C. Faculty Development Committee: Only four proposals for grants from the UMS Faculty Development Fund were received. The deadline for submissions has been extended to June 10, 1994. The grants are to support inter-institutional efforts within the UMS.

It was suggested that the committee reconsider the maximum grant award to attract more proposals, and that past projects be given greater publicity.

D. Relations with the General Assembly: M.J. McMahon asked that CUSF members renew the practice of inviting legislators to CUSF meetings, and that a legislative committee be formed before the summer so that it can work on strategy outside the legislative session.

It was suggested that the committee develop "talking points" and data to share with legislators.

VI. Report from the Chair:

A. MHEC Faculty Advisory Council (FAC): Larry Lasher reported that FAC supported the Faculty Regent bill, discussed SPRE's development of standards for review, and is reviewing of faculty handbooks around the state.

* Motion was made by Steve Rebach and seconded by Jay Alexander to send a note of thanks to the chair of the MHEC Faculty Advisory Council. Motion carried.

B. Executive Committee minutes: Questions about the faculty workload policy were discussed. A concern was expressed that the general guidelines from the BOR will not protect faculty from the institutions' interpretation of them.

C. Chancellor's Council: Four topics were addressed: (1) Faculty Productivity, (2) Draft Resolution on Undergraduate General Education Transferability, (3) Common Academic Calendar, and (4) Proposed Change in Policy on Annual Leave for Faculty (amending the policy to add provisions for part-time faculty).

It was observed that the common calendar may impact curricular issues, and that CUSF should have had a voice in the discussion of the common calendar.

* Motion was made and seconded to send a letter to the Chancellor that the CUSF was not adequately involved in the development of the common calendar. Motion carried, with thirteen in favor, four opposed, four abstentions,

* The Chair asked for input on the common calendar before the April 28 Executive Committee meeting. Larry Lasher will coordinate the comments.

* Committee on Improved Communication between UMS and CUSF: A request for follow-up was made.

The policy on annual leave was discussed. It was noted that many campuses are using nine and a half month contracts, so the reference in the policy to ten-month contracts may exclude faculty intended to be included.

* Comments on the draft Policy on Annual Leave should be sent to Executive Committee members by April 28. Joel Cohen will coordinate these comments.

D. Next meeting: at UMES, May 11, 10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m. Final meeting: at Wye Island, Friday, June 17. Meeting of old and new executive committee meetings: August.

It was suggested that new CUSF members be brought to the June meeting.

Motion to adjourn was made at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Schukoske, Secretary

**University of Maryland System
Council of the University System Faculty (CUSF)
Minutes of the meeting of Wednesday, May 11, 1994
University of Maryland Eastern Shore**

Present: Fox, SSU, Chair; Alexander, UMCP; Bambacus, FSU; Block, UMCP (voting alternate); Cohen, UMCP; Gill, UMBC; Goldman, UMAB; Hunt, UMCP; Jagus, UMBI (voting alternate); Johnson, SSU; Lasher, UMBC; Luchsinger, UB; McMahon, TSU; Rebach, UMES; Schukoske, UB; Talley, UMES; Tits, UMCP; Turner, UMCP.

Guests: George Marx, UMSA, Frank Komenda, UMSA, Maitland Dade, UMSA, Jim Doyle, UMES.

Absent: Arnold, UMAB; Brianas, UMUC; Brizzolara, TSU; Bowles, BSU; Chichester, CSC; Fletcher, UMBI; Friedman, TSU; Guilford, BSU; Hess-Vait, UMBC; Pergerson, CES-UMCP; Sternheim, UMCP; Varghese, UMAB; Wallinger, FSU; Wright, CEES.

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

I. Welcome: President William P. Hytche welcomed the Council to UMES and commended the CUSF for raising questions that should be asked generally and at the Chancellor's Council in particular. Dr. Jackie Thomas, Chair of the UMES Senate, also welcomed the CUSF. The Chair thanked Steve Rebach for arranging the meeting at UMES.

II. Approval of April minutes: Corrections were submitted: in Section IV.4.E, change "two" to "three" and add "UMUC" to the two schools listed. Motion was made and seconded that the minutes be approved as amended. Motion carried.

III. Report of the Vice Chancellor: Vice Chancellor Marx reported on faculty workload:

UMS Faculty Workload Policy dated May 9, 1994: The revised draft was distributed, with latest changes in bold capitals. The SWAT team will meet May 16 regarding final revisions. The BOR Educational Policy Committee will discuss the policy on May 26. The policy is due to the legislature on December 1.

Questions to Dr. Marx: If a department's target is 50% effort on instructional activity, and the institution's target is 65%, does another department have to pick up the difference? No, the guidelines are general. If the president makes a decision that one unit does not have to meet the target in the guidelines, it is up to the president how to handle it.

Qu: In a non-degree granting institution, what does 5-15% instructional effort mean? Instruction in some form is expected, but it could be supervising an intern, or other activities other than course instruction.

Qu: Will there be a response to the Frederick Post cartoon distributed at the meeting? Dr. Marx noted that the Chancellor has in the past sent a letter to the Sun describing faculty workload.

Qu: Why allow discretion to campuses about faculty workload, in light of the fact that on the smaller campuses workload demand may be excessive.

Suggestion: Change "addition" to "sum" in the bold text in the

middle of page 3.

Qu: Where in the policy does it make it clear that expectations are departmental rather than individual? Page 4, Section V (preface) and VI (para. 2).

Qu: For units involved in research, what protection is there against arbitrary distribution of workload within a department (see Section IV. para. 1 last sentence)? The policy does not make a change in this. The questioner noted that he believes the policy makes it easier to change expectations set with faculty when they were hired.

Qu: What is intended by "expectations" in the areas of "research/scholarship" (Page 4 first sentence)? It is to be defined by the institution.

Qu: In Section VI, what does "establish consequences for failure to fulfill expectations" mean for failure to fulfill scholarship expectations? It can be taken into account in setting salary and in any other ways currently.

Qu: Re. last line of page 4, does "extensiveness" mean "extent"? Yes.

Qu: Top of page 4, do institutions currently define research for tenured faculty within the institution's mission, as opposed to setting promotion and tenure standards? Suggestion: add "Workload" before expectations in the first sentence on page 4.

Qu: Will this policy statement satisfy external entities (the legislature and the public) seeking accountability? The answer appears to be yes; external entities are seeking a focus on instruction, faculty accountability for time, consequences for faculty who fail to perform. The policy is separate from reporting documents which will need to be created.

Qu: What is the legal situation regarding faculty who were hired with the expectation that they would teach two courses a semester and now are asked to teach additional courses? If the contract is that specific, there may be a legal claim. Many faculty may not have that specific a letter of appointment.

Qu: Is it perhaps helpful to have stated definitions of research to protect against arbitrariness because in part of differing expectations between departments and the institution?

Qu: Regarding teaching load, can there be a definition of teaching load that explicitly takes into account the number of students taught (beyond the Section V.1 reference to class size in considering exceptions from the standard instructional load)? The legislature used the term "course"; "weighted credit hour produced" will probably be the reporting standard.

Qu: If there are not sufficient students in a department to support five or six courses, what can be done? The president of an institution may decide that one course per year is a reasonable workload, but will have to justify it publicly if called on it (e.g., one course, 700 students). An institution might decide to reassign the faculty member, merge departments, etc.

Mission Statements (1993): A new publication of the UMS institutions' mission statements was circulated.

Academic calendar: Dr. Marx responded to the letter the CUSF chair sent to the Chancellor inquiring about the academic calendar. A "Policy on Academic Calendar" was distributed. vice presidents and presidents have approved the policy.

A resolution was proposed by Derek Gill: "That the CUSF enthusiastically endorse the Policy on Academic Calendar." It was seconded by Steve Rebach. Motion carried with one abstention.

UMS Budget: UMSA is seeking 9.9% increase in the budget for FY96: the CPS budget academic revenue bonds, cost of new facilities, and for funds to make up salary differences. The over-the-CPS budget focuses on investing in faculty and staff (1.75% salary increment and a plan to increase salaries to the 85th percentile over five years, recruitment and retention, and increasing endowed chairs), students (enhancement of the flagship campus, of the historically black institutions, of graduate programs, of undergraduate education, and for infrastructure of telecommunications), and economic development (Christopher Columbus Center and funds to further technology transfer). The asking budget will go to

the governor in mid-August.

Policy on Compensation for Faculty: A question was raised about whether this paragraph in Section I means that there will be no more cost-of-living increases for faculty:

"Salary increases for current faculty shall be based on merit, and shall be determined on the basis of exceptionally effective teaching, scholarship and public service. Equity considerations may be taken into account in awarding salary increases."

Dr. Marx said that this policy does not address cost-of-living increases, which are presently decided by the governor as COLAs are granted to state employees.

A point was made that the combination of the BOR policy and the proposed management flexibility bill could conceivably result in a loss of COLAs.

Redistribution of Vision II monies: Approximately \$1.6 million, 25% of the funds saved, were redistributed according to two criteria: (1) improvement of undergraduate education and (2) collaboration among UMS institutions. Seven of 28 proposals were selected by four outside reviewers. The seven included (1) SSU-UMES, (2) systemwide improvement in telecommunications, (3) nursing collaboration among TSU-UMAB-CSU, (4) UB-CSU collaboration, (5) engineering collaboration among FSU-UMBC and (6) UM library improvements.

IV. Old Business:

A. CUSF response to the Faculty Workload Policy: Larry Lasher proposed the following motions from the Executive Committee:

If possible, in section IV (second sentence) and section V (first sentence) and V.1, replace "exceptions" with "variations".

Motion failed.

In section IV, replace the sentence following the table with the following language: Instructional effort includes, in addition to classroom time, all concomitant activities necessary to the preparation and delivery and evaluation of

instruction and learning, including the various forms of student advising.

Motion carried.

That the first sentence of V.3 be changed to read as follows:
Assignment of additional time for research can be supported by the department or by external funds.

Motion carried.

That the examples of "modality of instruction" in V.1 be expanded to include additional alternative forms of instruction with special emphasis on studio classes, laboratories, workshops, etc. Suggested additional language, after "distance education": , instructional laboratories, studios, workshops and other pedagogical formats in which the disparity between contact hours and credit hours is significant.

Motion failed, with one abstention.

Motions from the floor:

Delete the sentence on page three, beginning "For example, a faculty member at a comprehensive institution..." and to replace "three credit" with "three class hours".

Motion failed for lack of a second.

Delete the sentence on page three, beginning "For example, a faculty member at a comprehensive institution..." to the end of the paragraph.

Motion second and motion carried.

Remove "including distance education" from section V.1.

Motion seconded and motion carried.

Remove "(teaching 300 vs 15 students)" from section V.1.

Motion seconded and motion carried.

Replace "three-credit" with "three-class hour" before courses

on page 3, sentence beginning "For purposes of defining..."

Motion seconded, motion failed, with one abstention.

Delete the sentence beginning with "For example..." (last word on page 4 through "industry").

Motion seconded and motion carried with three nos and two abstentions.

Add "Workload" before "[E]xpectations" at the top of page 4.

Motion seconded and motion carried with one abstention.

B. Open Meetings Law: Jane Schukoske reported that the law applies, and that it does not appear that the Council falls within any of the provisions which permit closing a meeting.

Questions were raised as to whether the meetings are open to media, and the answer is yes.

D. Legislative Committee report: Joel Cohen introduced Frank Komenda of UMSA State Relations. Frank Komenda complimented Joel Cohen and Kathy Fox for their work this year.

Mr. Komenda said that it is important that the faculty approach the legislature with straightforward information clearly stated for laypersons. Many legislators are raising issues such as whether research has economic or social value, and whether faculty remain productive after tenure.

Management Flexibility Bill: This bill was not passed but will be studied over the summer. CUSF can have input.

Faculty Regent Bill: The bill failed in the Senate on second reading. Sen. Dorman is willing to reintroduce the bill if faculty can speak as a single voice.

E. MHEC Draft Policy on Minimum Requirements for Degree-Granting Institutions: The requirements include one that at least one-third of the credit hours offered at a degree-granting institution be taught by full-time faculty. A proposal has been made that MHEC permit waivers of that requirement; this is being considered by the MHEC Educational Policy Committee.

CUSF requested the Chancellor to create a task force to deal with the issue.

It was the sense of those present that waivers may be dangerous, that waivers should not be to the definition of full-time faculty but to the 1/3 requirement.

F. Proposal for establishment of BOR Faculty Award: James Alexander brought this issue back onto the table for action. A resolution, sent out in advance, was discussed. It was suggested that "creative activity" be added to the category of "scholarship/research" category. Motion made to establish the award as proposed. Motion carried with two nos and one abstention.

V. New Business:

A. CUSF By-laws: Motion made and seconded to accept revisions mailed out in advance on first reading by M. Jane McMahon. 2.3 "will take" was changed to "'took"; 3.3 "shall be" to "are", in 5.6 add "shall" after "The Chair" where it appears in two places.

B. FY 96 Budget Priorities: This was deferred to the next meeting.

C. Post-tenure Review: This appeared on the vice presidents' agenda. CUSF Executive Committee will report back to the CUSF in June.

* Let Kathy Fox know if you are interested in serving on an Ad Hoc CUSF committee on this topic.

D. Distribution of CUSF work: It was suggested that the Executive Committee consider proposing subcommittees of the Educational Policy Committee to more equitably divide work.

IV. Report from the Chair: Reference was made to materials sent out ahead of time.

Motion to adjourn was made at 2:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Schukoske, Secretary

UNADOPTED DRAFT MINUTES (For use in preparing reports)

University of Maryland System

Council of the University System Faculty (CUSF)

Minutes of the meeting of Monday, October 10, 1994

Frostburg State University

Present: McMahon, TSU, Chair; Alexander, UMCP; Arnold, UMAB; Arthur, CSC; Bambacus, FSU; Block, UMCP; Fox, SSU; Friedman, TSU; Gill, UMBC; Goldman, UMAB; Haight, TSU (voting alternate); Johari-Courts, CSC; Lasher, UMBC; Lomonaco, UMBC; Schukoske, UB; Smith, SSU; Smith, TSU; Sternheim, UMCP; Wallinger, FSU.

Guests: Sen. John Haiper; Del. Betty Workman; George Marx, UMSA.

Absent: Bowles, BSU; Breslow, UMCP; Brianas, UMUC; Cohen, UMCP; Fletcher, UMBI; Glibert, CEES; Jagus, UMBI; Luchsinger, UB; Rebach, UMES; Shamoo, UMAB; Smith, TSU; Talley, UMES; Turner, UMCP; Varghese, UMAB.

Resigned: Andre Tits, UMCP.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. The Chair thanked Mike Wallinger and John Bambacus for arranging for use of the facilities at FSU.

I. Welcome: Provost Connie McGovern and Vice-Chair of the FSU Faculty Senate Dr. Maureen Connelly welcomed the CUSF. Area legislators also visited during the day.

II. Approval of September minutes: A correction was submitted to add to III.B. after "part-time" the words "(50% or more)" and add "million" after \$22 in IV. on page 5. Motion was made and seconded that the minutes be approved as amended. Motion carried. A request was made that the unadopted minutes be sent out on e-mail so that CUSF members can edit them for campus reports.

III. Election of Member-at-Large for the CUSF Executive Committee: Motion was made to change the place of this item on the agenda to the time slot before New Business. Motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

IV. Report of the Vice Chancellor: Vice Chancellor Marx reported:

A. Redeployment of Visions II funds: 75% will remain on the campus that generated the funds. Funds will be reallocated for (1) enhancing learning through technology, (2) enhancing learning through public service, (3) increasing access through university centers and (4) increasing diversity

within the UMS.

B. Financial Aid Policy: UMS is working on a policy to designate need-based and no-need financial aid (to attract talented out-of-state students into the state).

C. BOR to survey gubernatorial candidates on higher education issues: The candidates' responses will be distributed to members of the UMS community.

D. Benefits for Domestic Partners: The Department of Personnel has asked the BOR to take no action on this issue until the state has an opportunity to make a recommendation in view of the implications for state employees.

E. Faculty Leave: The policy was returned to committee to consider personal leave for part-time faculty.

F. Family and Medical Leave: A UMS committee is being chaired by Dobb Schmidt. Block, UMCP, and Basehart, SSU are the faculty representatives.

G. Early Retirement and Post-Tenure Review: UMS plans to consider legislation that would permit early retirement for faculty. The BOR will be considering a policy on post-tenure review; UMSA has sent out a nationwide survey on post-tenure review. CUSF will address these through its Administrative Issues Committee.

H. Reengineering of Administrative Processes (REAP): The review is two part: (1) does an administrative action need to be taken and (2) is there an easier way, using electronic communication, to do the necessary tasks? E.g., is a form necessary, and does it need to touch as many hands for signature as it does? The purpose is efficiency, not downsizing per se. Virginia Polytechnical Institute is a model of a higher education institution that has reengineered its administrative processes, and UMSA has studied its processes.

Nonproductive programs (249 were found by MHEC) will be reviewed. Some are mere reporting flukes, some may actually be cost-inefficient to operate but worth maintaining because of their exceptional quality. It was suggested that CUSF comment on the UMSA response.

Coordination of processes across institutions is also being reviewed. Two areas emerge: (1) cost-saving through buy-sell agreements regarding commonly bought goods and services, e.g., selection of common software across institutions, (2) coordination of systems affecting students, e.g., the Development Information System (DIS), coordinated by a committee outside UMSA.

I. Visions III: UMSA is considering interactive distance education technology to increase access for Maryland citizens to higher education.

J. Faculty Development Funds: The Chancellor has indicated that a similar amount of funds to that made available last year will be available this year.

K. Policy for Articulation and Transfer Between Non-Degree-Granting and Degree-Granting Institutions: The Articulation Policy was considered by AAAC and will now go to an MHEC Student Transfer Advisory Committee for consideration and comment. UMSA has two members on the committee, created in 1990.

V. Council Chair's Report:

A. BOR Meetings: There is an effort to make the meetings more interactive between the regents and those there to communicate with them. The agenda has been changed to facilitate more give and take.

B. Workshops on Managing Change at the Departmental Level: These workshops, co-sponsored by CUSF and UMSA, were held in early October and were favorably received by participants.

C. Revisions to the ART Document: A copy of the report to the AAAC was distributed. The title "instructor" will have a right to tenure review after six years. "Lecturers" are not entitled to tenure review. CUSF members should stimulate discussion on campuses and work with campus senates to be sure that faculty understand the implications on each campus. Comments should be directed to the campus Academic Vice Presidents, who have the draft.

A question was raised about the difference between tenure (meaning that a faculty member has a position as long as the

department exists) and job security (triggering due process rights but not protection against phasing out of a program).

The revised policy draft provides, on page 4 of the policy, for 90 days notice of non-renewal to faculty not on a tenure track whose service in less than seven years, and six months notice if such service exceeds seven years. The Chair said that an existing section of the ART document, I. C. 15, says that non-tenure faculty covered by the current ART document may opt to be covered by the current ART document protections.

It was pointed out that there is nothing in the draft policy or in the existing policy to prohibit an institution from failing to renew a non-tenure track faculty member's contract at the end of five and a half years, to start the clock over again.

It was suggested that there be a right of appeal of a non-renewal decision for non-tenure track faculty.

* CUSF members who have comments about the system-wide effect of the policy should send comments and proposed motions for CUSF action to the CUSF Chair so that a position can be taken at the November CUSF meeting. Action will be likely be taken by the AAAC at its December meeting.

D. Chancellor's Council: The group is outlining an agenda for Visions III. The CUSF Committee on Visions III is chaired by Arnold, UMAB. Other members are Cohen, Fox, Lomonaco, Rebach, and Shamoo; Alexander is a consultant on technology. The discussion of Visions III is centering on technological developments in higher education. Input is needed by November 1 so that CUSF can present ideas at the same time as the presidents. It is expected that the Chancellor will present a draft of Visions III at the beginning of January, 1995. The Chancellor's preliminary thoughts on the issue were presented in a speech he delivered in California; a copy will be sent to the CUSF.

* CUSF members who have ideas for shaping Visions III should state them to the committee. The CUSF Committee on Visions III will be reporting to the CUSF in November.

E. Non-instructional Productivity Survey: The Chair participated in a meeting on this survey to revise it to

better reflect the work of faculty.

F. Task Force on Non-traditional Institutions: While there has not been a written response, the Chancellor has indicated that this would be part of the larger conversation about the future of higher education. The CUSF has renewed its request for a task force.

The status of UMUC faculty who have received notices of non-renewal was discussed. One year's notice of termination has been given to the faculty at UMUC who have not been reassigned at administrators.

At the September 19 meeting with President Massey and Chancellor Langenberg, President Massey described the unique situation and history of UMUC and stated the reasons for his actions - insuring flexibility for the institution - to the CUSF Executive Committee.

It was noted that UMUC has always had representation on the CUSF despite the lack of tenure-track faculty. It was suggested that each UMS institution should have one representative on the CUSF, regardless of full-time faculty and that part-time faculty need representation within the UMS.

It was noted that UMUC has no faculty organization to whom the faculty representative reports.

It was observed that the CUSF should pay close attention to this issue in light of the fact that the "nontraditional" aspect of UMUC is offered as a justification for the institution's action, and that UMUC is touted as an institution of the future by the Chancellor.

A motion was made to disprove of UMUC's president's action in terminating full-time faculty and to continue to support UMUC's representation on the CUSF. Motion was seconded. Motion to table was made and seconded. Motion carried 10-6.

There was discussion of the helpfulness of having a written motion prior to a meeting. It was also noted that the CUSF can certainly pass motions that have not been presented in writing ahead of time.

It was noted that the CUSF does not have basic academic

information about how UMUC operates, such as how faculty are selected, how faculty are evaluated, how curriculum is designed, and other issues on which faculty have input. It was suggested that CUSF send a letter to the Chancellor requesting written information from the UMUC administration. The request will also be sent to a UMUC faculty member. The CUSF Educational Policy Committee can review the information and report to the CUSF at the November CUSF meeting. At that meeting, the CUSF can decide its next action

* CUSF members who have questions they want to propound about UMUC should send them on e-mail to a member of the CUSF Educational Policy Committee chaired by Lasher by October 14.

G. Senate Chairs and CUSF meeting October 29, 9:00 - noon at UMBC: An agenda for the meeting has been sent and no additional agenda items have been raised so far. That afternoon, the Senate chairs will meet with the Chancellor about shared governance.

VI. Greetings from Legislators:

Delegate Betty Workman: Delegate Workman, a retired teacher, noted that more educators and fewer attorneys seem to be getting elected to the state legislature, and that that is good for education in the state. In view of the fact that 52% of students in the UMS come in by transfer, she noted that it is important to have coordinated systems.

Del. Workman was asked what concerns legislators have about higher education. She responded that revenues will be down in the coming years, and that the budget will constantly prompt legislators to look for ways to economize.

Del. Workman was asked if she saw any particular higher education issues coming up in the 1995 session. She said that the changeover of people in Annapolis, from the governorship to changes in the legislature, make it hard to predict.

Senator John Haiper: Sen. Haiper serves on the Finance Committee. The House and Senate both stand the chance to have 50% new membership in 1995, and we will have a new governor. It will take a while to sort out support for

higher education. The revenue shortfall will keep budget issues on the table.

There are more groups organized and appearing before the Finance Committee in recent years.

VI. Committee Structure: Committee assignments are:

Recommendations for Visions III: Arnold, Chair; Cohen, Fox, Lomonaco, Rebach, and Shamoo. Alexander offered to consult with the committee on telecommunications issues due to his role on the UMS Telecommunications Committee.

Educational Policy Committee: Lasher, Chair; Block, Breslow, Gilbert, Gill, Lomonaco, Wallinger.

Finance Committee: Brianas, Chair; Haight. Meetings are on Tuesday mornings alternating between UMUC and UMAB. Additional committee members are needed.

Administrative Committee: Alexander, Chair; Courts, Lomonaco, and Schukoske. Block will serve as a consultant, since he is on the UMS Family and Medical Leave Committee. Benefits for Domestic Partners, TIAA- CREF issues and Early Retirement are two issues on the agenda.

VII. Committee Reports

A. Educational Policy: The committee is formulating its agenda for the year. Post-tenure review and the larger implications of the UMUC structure have been suggested as agenda items. The Visions II funds, 75% of which will stay on the campus, will be reallocated for (1) enhancing learning through technology, (2) enhancing learning through public service, (3) increasing access through university centers and (4) increasing diversity within the UMS.

Regent Berndt is holding a luncheon for some faculty in November to informally discuss issues of concern to those present. Lasher submitted suggested names to Regent Berndt.

It was suggested that the Committee serve as a clearinghouse on the issue of post-tenure review for campus action. The Committee should collect information on faculty workload policies in the UMS and post-tenure systems in the UMS as well as information on the national level. The information can be made available to the CUSF and campuses. Vice Chancellor Marx said that he expects a BOR post-tenure

review policy will be under discussion about a year from now. It was suggested that the Committee submit an interim report in January, 1995, and a final report in May, 1995. Information will be gathered at the October 29 Senate Chairs meeting and reported to the CUSF in November.

VIII. Unfinished Business:

A. CUSF Constitution and By-laws: The CUSF Executive Committee recommends that Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution remain unchanged (to reflect the history of the UMS). The title should be corrected to read "University of Maryland System Constitution for the Council of University System Faculty". Motion made and seconded to approve the changes to the Constitution as sent out in advance of the meeting, with Article II, Section 3 unchanged and typographical errors corrected. Motion carried 15-1.

IX. Election of At-Large Member of CUSF Executive Committee:

Ballots were distributed for the election of a member-at-large to serve on the Executive Committee. Joyce Bowles carried the election by a majority (10-6) of those present and voting.

X. New Business:

A. Tenure: The move from full-time faculty to adjunct faculty has ramifications for higher education and for students.

Motion to adjourn was made at 2:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Schukoske, Secretary

UNADOPTED DRAFT MINUTES (For use in preparing reports)

University of Maryland System

Council of the University System Faculty (CUSF)

Minutes of the meeting of Wednesday, November 16, 1994

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Present: McMahon, TSU, Chair; Alexander, UMCP; Arnold, UMAB; Arthur, CSC; Block, UMCP; Bowles, BSU; Breslow, UMCP; Cohen, UMCP; Fox, SSU; Friedman, TSU; Glibert, CEES; Gill, UMBC; Goldman, UMAB; Haight, TSU; Jagus, UMBI; Luchsinger, UB;

Johari-Courts, CSC; Lasher, UMBC; Lomonaco, UMBC; Rebach, UMES; Schukoske, UB; Shamoo, UMAB; Smith, A., SSU; Smith, R., TSU; Smith, C., UMCP; Sternheim, UMCP; Varghese, UMAB; Wallinger, FSU.

Guests: Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA; Nance Lucas, UMCP, at UMSA for a year; George Marx, UMSA.

Absent: Bambacus, FSU; Brianas, UMUC; Langdon, BSU; Talley, UMES.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. The Chair thanked Larry Lasher for arranging for use of the facilities at UMBC.

I. Welcome: Provost Joanne Argersinger stated that she looked forward to working with the CUSF on faculty development issues and that UMBC has taken shared governance seriously as a means of sparking creativity on the campus. Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Art Johnson also welcomed the CUSF and urged thorough reporting back to faculty on the campuses. UMBC Faculty Senate Chair Marvin Mandell complimented the CUSF on improved communication between CUSF and the campus senates. Alcott Arthur, CSC, and Carl Smith, UMCP, were introduced as new CUSF members.

II. Approval of November minutes: Corrections were made to the attendance list (delete Smith, TSU, from absentee list and remove Fletcher and Turner, who have left the CUSF) and an amendment to the first sentence on the top of page 5 to add "from which the representative is elected and" before "to whom". Motion was made and seconded that the minutes be approved as amended. Motion carried.

III. Report of the Vice Chancellor:

A. Items to be considered by the Educational Policy Committee on November 17, 1994, reported by George Marx:

1. Financial Aid Policy: The BOR is considering amendment of its Financial Aid Policy. There is a question as to what proportion of a tuition increase may be allocated to financial aid. The BOR policy has a restricted definition of merit; a proposal was made to add "athletic talent". There is a question as to what percentage of an institution's revenue allocation can be devoted to financial aid: choices are 5%, 7% or 10%. At present, only one institution exceeds 4.4%

2. Faculty Workload: The data collected from the institutions' reports will be presented to the BOR at its November meeting.

C. BOR to survey gubernatorial candidates on higher education issues: The candidates' responses will be distributed to members of the UMS community.

B. Items under review by the Academic Review Advisory Committee, reported by George Marx:

1. Revisions to the ART document: The deadline for comment has passed but comments can still be sent to Cheryl Samuels at UMSA. AAAC will review the proposed revisions at its December 2 meeting. A copy of a November 11 letter from Stephen Havas, President, UMAB Faculty Senate, to Cheryl Samuels was distributed.

2. Faculty Awards: The CUSF has submitted names to assist AAAC regarding these.

3. Graduate Faculty: The AAAC is considering a policy to formalize participation of graduate faculty in graduate activities of other UMS institutions (e.g., service on dissertation committees).

C. Budget: There was a meeting with the Governor about the budget. UMSA asked for \$14 million in the over-the-CPS budget. Issues were: correlation of increase in funding for increased enrollment and the general lack of an over-the-CPS budget for faculty was discussed. The lack of increased funding for increased enrollment has had a negative impact on the historically black institutions.

D. General Education Common Core Curriculum: Helen Giles-Gee reported on this issue. The Secretary of Education has recently proposed an increase the minimum requirements for all two- and four-year state institutions. The common core curriculum could include specific course titles. Comment is being solicited. A CUSF member will serve on the task force addressing this issue. MHEC's Faculty Advisory Council will meet for the first time on the issue at the end of November. MHEC's Student Transfer Policy was distributed. A preliminary report will be presented December 13 to MHEC and the issue will be taken up in the spring.

* On the campuses, faculty serving on curriculum committees need to scrutinize this issue. It was suggested that CUSF alert the campus Senate chairs pointing out the issue.

E. MHEC proposal of a fifth year program following a baccalaureate degree: The Chancellor has commented by letter on a model proposed that the model was a good one but should

not be the only permissible model. It was noted that it was unusual for a curricular proposal to come from MHEC rather than emanating from faculty control of curriculum on the campuses.

F. Data on Faculty Roles and Rewards: Nance Lucas presented the data collected by UMSA from its survey of institutions around the country. The survey was sent primarily to provosts' offices of institutions which were doing work on post-tenure review according to AAHE files (which institutions had a high response rate) and UMS peers (little response). 48.8% of the respondents have a post-tenure review process and another 9.3% are developing them. To follow up on the draft Survey Summary, UMSA plans to conduct telephone interviews. The majority of institutions responding were research institutions; UMSA will make an effort to collect information about comprehensive institutions. A formal report will be issued and distributed in December.

It was observed that there is a lack of definition of terms, e.g., "post-tenure review" in question 1. Giles-Gee said that the post-tenure review policies were requested and are being compared with the survey answers. It was observed that respondents seemed to merge annual review and post-tenure review. Giles-Gee said that the process would be up to the campuses. Nance said that some institutions described two processes: an annual review for salary adjustments and five-year reviews that are comprehensive.

The Faculty Workload Policy passed by the BOR refers to consequences that will flow from meeting or failing to meet workload expectations. Post-tenure review is a response.

The Council much appreciates that the survey was conducted by UMSA. The collaborative effort between UMSA and CUSF in studying this issue was applauded.

IV. Chair's Report: The chair noted highlights from her written "Chair's Report for November, 1994".

A. Visions III, "A Community of Scholars": The Chair noted that she has received very positive response to the CUSF document from provosts and faculty.

B. Meeting with campus Senate Chairs and the CUSF Executive

Committee: Minutes were distributed. A correction was noted to page 4 of the minutes, to note that staff and students are represented in the UMCP senate as well as faculty. Another meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 21, 1995.

C. Distribution of information at meetings: It was suggested that handouts for meetings be made available at the beginning of the CUSF meetings so that members who wish to may read the materials before discussion.

V. Committee Reports:

A. Visions III: UMSA is formulating a Visions III document, which will involve use of new technologies among other topics. The Chancellor is collecting input from many constituencies, including the presidents and CUSF. CUSF's draft report, "A Community of Scholars", was presented for comments, which were: The document should give greater emphasis to the importance of the personal, one-on-one and classroom interactions in higher education. The document does not give adequate emphasis to research other than technological or product-driven research. The single example in paragraph 3 should be excised (because there are many examples). The two sentences at the end of the first paragraph of "II. A Broader Educational Mix" need revision.

* Specific wording should be sent by e-mail or fax to Elizabeth Arnold, UMAB, Chair, fax 410-738-6040 by November 21.

Motion was made to support the direction of the committee draft and to allow the Visions III Committee to make further revisions based on input from the CUSF. Motion was seconded and carried 22-0.

B. Educational Policy Committee:

1. Meeting with Regents from the BOR Educational Policy Committee: CUSF Executive Committee members and other faculty representatives met with six regents from the Committee. Topics were improvement of communication to Annapolis about faculty workload issues and the faculty regent bill.

2. Periodic Review of Faculty: At the joint meeting of the campus senate chairs and the CUSF Executive Committee, the

CUSF Educational Policy Committee was asked to draft a set of principles for a program of periodic review of tenured faculty in the UMS. A copy was distributed and comment on it invited.

Comments were made on the following: Page 1, paragraph 2's language about modifying attitudes is too punitive; Page 1, paragraph A's "collegial assessment" is unclear; Page 2, paragraph b "improving less satisfactory performance" and other language that suggests interference with academic freedom is acceptable.

It was proposed that the following language be added, perhaps in paragraph D after the first sentence: "Nothing in the process of periodic review shall be construed as approving in any way the intrusion of any individual or body, administrative or collegial, into the selection of area, direction, or approach of the research or scholarly pursuits of any faculty member." Comment was made that the statement might be worded more positively, as academic freedom is a key part of the educational atmosphere.

It was also proposed that the second paragraph on the first page be replaced with : "The faculty of UMS recognize that periodic review is an important process in the pursuit of excellence in teaching, research and service activities of the university. The general purpose of periodic review of faculty shall be to review individual faculty performance over time in order to reward performance or to seek to improve performance when appropriate. Principles of shared governance and mutual trust between faculty and administration will guide this process."

Question was made as to whether the CUSF wants to support the idea of periodic review as discussed at this meeting.

Motion was made: "This body supports in principle the practice of pre- and post-tenure review of faculty." Motion was seconded. Motion to table the motion to support review failed. Motion to amend the original motion to change the word "pre- and post-tenure" review" to "periodic faculty review" was seconded, and motion carried 15-1. Discussion addressed the lack of definition of terms. The amended motion reads, "This body supports in principle the practice of periodic faculty review." Motion carried 15-3.

It was suggested that the document title be "Principles for a Program of Periodic Review of Faculty".

It was suggested that CUSF work on a technical basis with UMSA rather than work on developing a set of overarching principles.

Motion to convene as a committee of the whole. Motion seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

After reconvening, motion made to refer the principles back to the Educational Policy Committee for further revision. Motion seconded and motion carried unanimously.

3. UMUC Question: The Chancellor responded to the request for a task force on the issue of the role of faculty at non-traditional institutions by a letter of October 14 to the CUSF Chair.

Discussion of the Chancellor's letter followed. It was noted that the idea of a task force on the role of faculty in non-traditional institutions was a counterproposal from UMSA to addressing the UMUC issue directly. Several people suggested that a response to the letter was necessary. It was noted that CUSF sent a letter of October 26 to the Chancellor by Larry Lasher on behalf of the Educational Policy Committee.

Motion was made to wait another month to see what response, if any, there is to the October 26 letter. Motion was seconded and carried.

4. General Education Core Curriculum Proposal: CUSF members were asked to send comments from the campuses to Larry Lasher as soon as possible.

B. Legislative Committee: The Committee recommended support for reintroduction of the substance of Faculty Regent Bill (1994 S.B. 707). The Chancellor's Council will consider the bill on December 6.

Motion was made to support introduction of the substance of S.B. 707 in the 1995 session.

Amended motion made to support introduction of the substance of S.B. 707 and the Legislative Committee will explore to see

if there is a possibility of a stronger bill. Motion was seconded. Amended motion failed 6-8.

Substitute motion was made and seconded to support introduction of a bill establishing one voting faculty regent. Motion failed 4-10.

Original motion was voted on: to support introduction of the substance of S.B. 707 in the 1995 session. Motion carried 13-2.

C. Administrative Issues Committee: The report was deferred to the December meeting.

Comment was made that "Old Business" and "New Business" slipped off the agenda due to the length of the meeting, and that the meeting should be structured to permit discussion. The Chair asked that items of old and new business be communicated to her the day before the meeting begins, if at all possible, so that she can plan time for it in managing the agenda.

Motion to adjourn was made at 3:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Schukoske, Secretary

UNADOPTED DRAFT MINUTES (For use in preparing reports)
University of Maryland System
Council of the University System Faculty (CUSF)
Minutes of the meeting of Thursday, April 13, 1995
Coppin State University

Present: McMahon, TSU, Chair; Alexander, UMCP; Arthur, CSC; Bowles, BSU; Cohen, UMCP; Fox, SSU; Friedman, TSU; Gill, UMBC; Goldman, UMAB; Haight, TSU; Jagus, UMBI; Lasher, UMBC; Luchsinger, UB; Rebach, UMES; Schukoske, UB; Shamoo, UMAB; Smith, A., SSU; Smith, C., UMCP; Smith, R., TSU; Sternheim, UMCP; Wallinger, FSU.

Guests: George Marx, UMSA.

Absent: Arnold, UMAB; Bambacus, FSU; Block, UMCP; Booth, UMAB; Breslow, UMCP; Glibert, CEES; Johari-Courts, CSC; Langdon, BSU; Lomonaco, UMBC; Talley, UMES; and Varghese, UMAB

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. The Chair thanked Alcott Arthur for arranging for use of the facilities at CSU.

I. Welcome: President Burnett sent greetings to the CUSF on behalf of CSU.

II. Approval of the minutes of March, 1995: Corrections were suggested on page 6, paragraph 4: change "board of outsiders" to "board of UMS faculty", and add the sentence "The Chancellor indicated that it might be worth exploring the possibility of including among the UMUC board of visitors distinguished academics from universities outside UMS". Also, in the next paragraph, the word "tradition" was changed to "traditional".

III. Report of the Vice Chancellor:

A. Budget: Rather than year-by-year budget planning, the new approach will be to prepare a four-year funding plan for UMS. The first year of the four-year plan will be the forthcoming budget year. The budgeting will be based on the accountability plans submitted to MHEC. Categories of budget planning at present are: improvement of undergraduate, technological improvement, systematic programs in faculty development re. new technologies, competitive faculty salaries (set by institutional priorities rather than system-wide), research and graduate education, technology transfer, and regional centers developing around the state (Shady Grove, Harford County, etc.). The three areas designated for UMS enhancement are: the flagship campus (UMCP), historically black institutions, and graduate programs around Baltimore (UMAB Medical Center and the Downtown Center). Brenda Albright is chairing a committee to investigate the appropriate per-student funding, with a goal of increasing parity among students at the various institutions.

All institutions have submitted budget proposals for FY 1997 on the assumption that there would be a CPI increase plus 2%. Capital budgets have been treated on a separate track than operating budgets. The interest on academic revenue bonds is paid by UMS; the interest on general revenue bonds is not.

A question was raised about the Regents' goal of reaching the 85 percentile of peer institutions in faculty salaries. As this matter is handled by institutions, the goal may matter more to some institutions than others.

B. Vision III: The CUSF document is still a starting point. Some features of the future that seem relevant to planning

are: the expectation that increases in tuition and fees will be discouraged, increased consumerism among students, age demographics of students, refocus of research to see that it addresses applications. The future will focus on technology, student access to institutions, quality, efficiency in addressing student needs, increase in productivity of institutions, inter alia.

The process will begin with meetings with the Regents, there will be a draft document prepared for the May 1 Chancellor's Council meeting regarding the goals of access quality and productivity, the draft document will be submitted to the Regents at their June meeting. After input and discussion, it is expected that the Regents will vote on a document at the October meeting.

A question was raised about the relationship between the visions statement and the policies adopted by the Regents. The strategic priorities of the UMS are set by the Regents. Vision I indicated that there needed to be a tuition policy and financial aid policy, and those policies have been passed. The vision statements set a direction for about the next 18 months.

C. Business Process Reengineering: The \$13 million to be redeployed from administrative cost-saving: financial processes including procurement, student services processes, and alumni processes. The Regents say that to do this, there will need to be wider use of computers, that investment in computers will be necessary, that that investment will come from existing resources. The UMS will be part of the state's financial management system. There will be a central payroll office.

A question was asked about when funds would be available for redeployment. Marx suggested that due to the up-front costs of the new approach, it may be five years before funds are available to redeploy.

D. ART Document: Marx distributed a revised ART Document.

E. Pew Initiative: This is a grant proposal made by UMSA to provide support for the directions UMS is moving in: (1) better articulation with K - 12 education system (a) to help establish performance factors, and (b) to reexamine higher

education admission requirements to make them performance-based; (2) accountability efforts that will increasingly demonstrate that we are producing a product of merit, shown by using student learning outcomes as a measure; (3) to minimize redundancies between high school and first year college courses; and (4) to increase community involvement in the school systems to make long-term systemic changes. Pew is amenable to this proposal.

A cautionary comment was made about the importance of admission requirements that go beyond high school performance test scores.

A question was asked as to whether the Pew initiative would include the issue of transfer of credits and the answer was that it was related but not one of the four foci.

A comment was raised about the inadequate preparation of some students for college. Marx suggested that perhaps universities could contract with Sylvan Learning Centers, which have a proven record of success with remedial education. A comment was made that what may happen in re-norming the examinations so that school systems show successful results.

A question was raised about faculty involvement in the proposal to Pew. Marx responded that TSU is already working with the Department of Education on these kinds of issues.

F. General Education and Transfer Policy: Marx distributed a document from the Intersegmental Committee of Chief Academic officers.

F. Teacher Education: Marx distributed a copy of the report on this issue.

IV. Council Chair's Report: The Chair distributed a written report and highlighted the following items:

A. Process at BOR meeting: The Chair expressed concern that the time slot for CUSF at the BOR meeting does not provide a good opportunity for exchange between the regents and CUSF. She said that the Executive Committee would discuss whether to raise the issue with the Chancellor.

B. Intersegmental Conference: This conference involved UMSA,

community colleges and the state Department of Education. Helen Giles-Gee was commended for her excellent work on this conference and on intersegmental matters generally.

C. UMS Task Force on Periodic Review of Faculty: Four names were forwarded to UMSA: Larry Goldman, UMAB; Larry Lasher, UMBC; M.J. McMahon, CUSF Chair/TSU; and Christopher Davis, UMCP, for the three CUSF spots and one faculty member-at-large. Marx asked for additional names, so that UMSA has some flexibility in selection of the other members of the task force. The Chair and the Secretary will solicit additional volunteers.

D. Faculty Development Conference: Plans are on track for this conference Saturday April 29, 1995 at UMBC.

E. Input from campuses: Input was requested by the Chair or a committee chair on three subjects in the last month, and few responses were received. She asked for prompt response to e-mail and faxes. A comment was made that on certain issues the CUSF should respond that more time is needed to develop a thoughtful response to a complex issue.

IV. Committee Reports:

A. Educational Policy: Larry Lasher distributed a document recommending a delay in implementation of the General Education Transfer Regulations because (1) there was insufficient opportunity for faculty involvement in the development of the policy; (2) there has never been proof that transfer of credits is a problem; (3) problems with the proposal have not been solved; (4) the document envisions a menu-driven, credit-counting approach to general education which is apt to have a chilling effect on imaginative approaches to general education.

Lasher requested comment on the document to him by e-mail before the next CUSF meeting.

The timeframe for action is: May 15 CUSF meeting; May 18 BOR Educational Policy Committee meeting at which BOR action could be requested.

It was suggested that CUSF respond in two ways: (1) oppose the process which did not realistically provide for faculty input;

and (2) oppose the substance as needed. It was noted that the MHEC Faculty Advisory Council endorsed the general education and transfer policy.

A rough draft of the proposed revisions by Intersegmental Committee of Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) was distributed. The CAOs response is to the proposed COMAR regulations.

Questions posed (broader than the policy itself): Is the concept of a general education common core a notion that we support or not support? Is there middle ground? It was noted that the policy actually allows some discretion to the receiving institution.

Marx reported that the general education policy arose from work of the CAOs two years ago. What the document represents is a policy for transferability of credits, not a common core.

Marx noted that CUSF advises the Chancellor, and that the Chancellor would not necessarily pass on to the BOR a recommendation to delay this policy because the policy is forging a working relationship between community colleges and the four-year institutions.

Luchsinger noted that all undergraduate students at UB transfer in, and that he has not seen a problem with the policy.

Marx pointed out that COMAR already has a regulation on general education courses.

It was noted that the policy could lead to common courses and a common syllabus.

Motion was made to endorse the proposed COMAR regulations as amended by the document entitled "Rough Draft" (dated April 6, 1995). Motion seconded. Motion made to table. Motion to table failed. Motion made to amend to delete language as suggested in Ira Block's e-mail (hard copy distributed at the meeting), motion seconded. Motion to amend failed. Original motion failed.

Marx suggested that faculty work through the CAOs for changes like those suggested by Ira Block's e-mail.

Motion made that the Chair express to the Chancellor CUSF's strong reservations about the process, lack of faculty involvement, used to develop the general education and transfer policy document and proposed COMAR language, and that the CUSF inform all senate chairs of the timelines for comment and to ask them to examine the document with care and provide comment to their CAOs and to MHEC. Motion to amend the motion to remove the language "to the Chancellor". Motion to amend failed. Original motion carried unanimously.

Lasher noted that the process problem should be reported to the regents. The chair indicated she would include it in her report.

Motion made that CUSF recommend that the committees called for in the general education policy - transfer mediation committee and the transfer advisory committee - have majority representation by faculty. It was suggested that deliberations and actions of the committee go out to the campuses for comment. The motion was referred to the CUSF Education Policy Committee for refinement.

B. Nominations Committee: Gill reported the slate: Chair: Joel Cohen; Vice Chair: Larry Lasher; Secretary, Michael Wallinger; Members at Large: Steve Rebach and Pat Glibert. Nominations from the floor were requested. Motion made that the nominations be closed, seconded, and motion carried, with one opposed. It was suggested that the restrictive by-laws provision that prohibits two members of the executive committee from the same institution be reviewed by the Administrative Committee in the fall, 1995.

C. UMSA Staff Participation at CUSF Meetings: Motion made that staff be invited to give their reports in the morning and stay for lunch. Discussion included these points: (1) staff are indispensable to provide information, (2) the presence of staff chills discussion, (3) it is important for UMSA staff to hear the concerns of CUSF: thoughts, anger, frustration; (4) it has been suggested that staff exclusion would undercut the credibility of CUSF; (5) time for discussion of campus issues is important; (6) under the sunshine law, the CUSF cannot close its meetings. Motion failed.

D. Board of Regents Faculty Award: Luchsinger distributed a memorandum from Daniel Fallon dated March 17, 1995. It was

noted that UMUC is listed, referring to fall, 1993 faculty figures; it was suggested that it be noted that the full-time faculty figures for 1995 be used, with the result that UMUC should be removed.

E. Legislative Committee: The Faculty Regent Bill passed both House and Senate but failed in conference committee over the issues of whether the faculty member could have a vote and whether a staff member should be added to the BOR.

It was suggested that this item be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

Motion to adjourn was made at 3:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Schukoske, Secretary

UNADOPTED DRAFT MINUTES (For use in preparing reports)
University of Maryland System
Council of the University System Faculty (CUSF)
Minutes of the meeting of Monday, May 15, 1995
Center for Environmental and Estuarine Studies
Chesapeake Biological Laboratory

Present: McMahon, TSU, Chair; Alexander, UMCP; Arthur, CSC; Block, UMCP; Bowles, BSU; Breslow, UMCP; Cohen, UMCP; Fox, SSU; Gill, UMBC; Glibert, CEES; Goldman, UMAB; Langdon, BSU; Lasher, UMBC; Lomonaco, UMBC; Luchsinger, UB; Schukoske, UB; Shamoo, UMAB; Smith, A., SSU; Smith, C., UMCP; Smith, R., TSU; Sternheim, UMCP; Wallinger, FSU; Wright, CEES/CBI (alternate).

Guests: Senator Michael Miller; Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA.

Absent: Arnold, UMAB; Bambacus, FSU; Booth, UMAB; Friedman, TSU; Haight, TSU; Jagus, UMBI; Johari-Courts, CSC; Rebach, UMES; Talley, UMES; and Varghese, UMAB;.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. The Chair thanked Pat Glibert and Dave Wright for making the arrangements for use of the facilities.

I. Welcome from Senator Miller: Dave Wright introduced Senator Michael Miller, Maryland Senate President, who said that he hopes higher education will hold its own in the next few years but does not anticipate significant increases in funding. The legislature has increased taxes on cigarettes and alcohol, but he anticipates that there will be a state personal income tax decrease

next year, so that there will likely not be increases in higher education spending. He urged the CUSF to advocate that the governor put higher education increases into his budget for next year. He also anticipates that there will be a system name change to make it less confusing.

In response to a question about how he would reform Maryland's higher education structure, he said he would restore separate boards for each institution. When asked what role he sees for UMMSA, he said he would have to see who is appointed as the new Secretary.

The Faculty Regent Bill as filed passed the Senate, but the House's amendments were not acceptable to the Senate when the bill came back to conference committee.

Senator Miller was asked whether the legislature thought it was getting its money's worth from higher education in Maryland. He said he thought the legislators were generally satisfied, but responded to the perception that professors should spend more time in the classroom. He said people want more bang for the buck, and that legislators respond to that.

II. Approval of the minutes of March and April, 1995: A correction to the March, 1995 minutes was made: that C. Smith, UMCP, was absent from that meeting. He was mistakenly listed as present. With this correction, the March minutes were approved as presented.

The April minutes as submitted were approved by acclamation.

III. Report of the Associate Vice Chancellor:

A. Vision III: Helen Giles-Gee distributed a revised draft in response to comments received by May 8 on "Achieving the Vision III: Building on Strength". It was noted that the document has a political purpose as well as a planning purpose: to make a mark in higher education. The section on Quality does not use the work "research" or "scholarship".

B. Regents Award for Faculty: Giles-Gee distributed a sheet entitled "Summary of Item for Information, Consideration and Action on Regents Award for Faculty" for the BOR Educational Policy Committee on May 18. There was discussion of the fiscal impact - that the BOR has no discretionary funds, but the UM Foundation could raise funds.

C. Generic Survey of Faculty Productivity: The information is sent to UMS in the aggregate and is given to the legislature. It was suggested that the UMS and the institutions try to coordinate reporting periods.

D. Draft MHEC policy on Articulation between non-degree granting and degree-granting institutions (including high

schools and proprietary schools): UMSA comments are noted on the draft. If CUSF members have comments, you may contact Giles-Gee, Marx or Loretta Wertheimer. This document does not apply to community colleges (which grant associate degrees). The policy was written in response to federal initiatives on school-to-work and technical preparation programs.

Giles-Gee asked if CUSF sees additional issues that warrant comment. She had no information on the timetable for consideration of the draft. It has not yet gone to the MHEC Faculty Council.

The Chair asked the CUSF Educational Policy Committee to consider the issue, and asked CUSF members to comment to the committee.

E. General Education Meeting: A letter to GEM participants dated April 26 was distributed.

IV. Council Chair's Report: The Chair distributed a written report and highlighted the following items:

A. UMS Pay Plan: The Chair expressed concern that there is no implementation for the staff pay plan. The delay in implementation has the effect of saving the state money. The steps in the schedule are about 3% increases. Data on the issue was requested.

Motion made and seconded to form a small committee to study the issue and report at the June meeting. Motion carried, 15-0.

B. UMS Task Force on Periodic Review of Faculty: The following names were forwarded to UMSA: Ira Block, UMCP; Derek Gill, UMBC; Larry Goldman, UMAB; Joan Langdon, BSU; Larry Lasher, UMBC; McMahan, CUSF Chair/TSU; and Christopher Davis, UMCP.

V. Welcome: President Donald Boesch sent greetings to the CUSF on behalf of CBI and CEES' other two laboratories. He noted that the founding date for Chesapeake Biological Institute was 1925. He spoke about service to the citizens of the state. He read an excerpt from Jane Smiley's Moo. He noted that Vision III not only does not mention research, but also does not mention service. He thinks that the service mission of

the faculty needs to be broadened to stress community service, rather than just internal university and UMS committees. He suggested that faculty should look at how we can reverse urban blight, how we can integrate people who have committed crime back into society, how we can address environmental issues more effectively. The Chair thanked President Boesch for his remarks and noted that it was refreshing to hear a president stress the importance of service.

VI. Committee Reports:

A. Educational Policy: Larry Lasher summarized CUSF action on the General Education Transfer policy: (1) the chair sent a letter to the Chancellor about the lack of faculty involvement in the process; (2) the chair notified the campuses about the forthcoming regulations; and (3) the committee recommends additions to COMAR language. Motion made and approved that the following underlined language be added to new Title 13B, Subtitle 06, GENERAL EDUCATION AND TRANSFER:

In section .04 Transfer of General Education Credit

G. Sending and receiving institutions that disagree on the interpretation of the transfer of general education courses as defined by the Chapter shall submit their disagreements to a Transfer Mediation Committee that is designated by the Secretary and represents the public four-year institutions and community colleges. A majority of the membership of the Transfer Mediation Committee shall be faculty members of the public four-year institutions.

In section .09 Periodic Review

C. The Maryland Higher Education Commission shall establish a permanent Transfer Advisory Committee that meets regularly to review transfer issues and recommend policy changes as needed. A majority of the membership of the Transfer Advisory Committee shall be faculty members from the public four-year institutions and the community colleges.

Regarding BOR Faculty Awards, motion was made and seconded that CUSF supports the principle of recognition of UMS faculty

and that the issue of monetary reward is up to the BOR and Lasher has the authority to express this at the BOR Educational Policy Committee meeting.

Vision III: Ira Block drafted proposed changes to the draft. Motion made to reconsider the CUSF decision passed at the last meeting to provide individual, not CUSF, comment on the Vision III draft. Motion seconded. Motion to table was seconded. Motion to table carried, 8-7.

It was suggested that CUSF address global issues, such as specifically identifying research and service in the UMSA document. It was suggested that technical drafting ideas be sent by individuals or by small groups of signatories, that they need not be a CUSF position paper. Ira Block agreed to serve on an ad hoc committee to collect comment both on global and technical issues from CUSF members to share with the rest of the Council at the June meeting. Comments should be provided to Ira Block by May 29. Ira Block can be reached on electronic mail at ib4@umail.umd.edu and by fax at (301)314-9601.

It was observed that the Maryland Information Network and Directories (m.i.n.d.) deserves CUSF attention.

The Governor plans to release his own views on Vision III on June 15.

Reminder: Send comments on Draft MHEC policy on Articulation between non-degree granting and degree-granting institutions (including high schools and proprietary schools) to Lasher.

B. Legislative Committee: The CUSF discussed "A Proposal For Strengthening Faculty Input to Regents' Decisions" submitted by the Chancellor to the Chancellor's Council. It proposes ex officio membership on all BOR committees for the CUSF Chair, and it is in exchange for a CUSF agreement that it not press for a Faculty Regent for three years. The presidents have discussed this as a credible solution that should be seriously pursued. The Regents would likely meet on this issue at its August meeting.

It was suggested that the proposal be accepted as a step in the right direction of securing a voting faculty regent, with the addition of attendance at executive sessions and of the

CUSF Chair's ability to designate someone else to attend meetings in her/his place. It was noted that the proposal offers the advantage of early implementation, without waiting through another legislative session. Its disadvantage is that it is not a voting position; if it were a condition that CUSF will stop pressing for a Faculty Regent bill for three years, that would be another disadvantage.

It was suggested that there is a conflict of interest in having a CUSF member - advisory to the Chancellor - as the designated representative. It was noted that CUSF does not need to come back with an immediate response.

The Chair suggested that the former CUSF Chair or the Vice Chair serve rather than the CUSF Chair, who has a very heavy schedule.

It was suggested that the proposal be accepted free of conditions.

It was suggested that the matter be taken up at the next meeting, that the position be assumed by someone other than the Chair, that the proposal be implemented as an interim measure, and that CUSF seeks full participation in all matters except personnel matters. It was suggested that the matter be taken up informally with the Chancellor to see whether there is a good reason

C. Nominations Committee: It presented the following slate for election by ballot: Joel Cohen, Chair; Larry Lasher, Vice Chair; Michael Wallinger, Secretary; Steve Rebach and Pat Glibert, at-large members. With 19 present in the room, there were 17 votes in favor of the slate of officers, and two abstentions. The slate was duly elected.

D. Administrative Issues: J. Alexander reported that there has been no feedback on the Domestic Partnership issue from the campuses besides UMCP, and may come back as an issue in the fall. He reported that nothing seems to have occurred regarding early retirement. Regarding UMUC, the committee proposed that J. Alexander contact the Chancellor to see what was possible to do; the Chancellor has been unavailable. There are two by-laws suggestions which will be addressed in the fall (whether there should be a chair-elect, and whether there should be a revision to the policy that no two members

of the CUSF Executive Committee may be at the same institution. UMATS (U. Md. Academic Telecommunications System committee) is addressing m.i.n.d. (see attachment to draft of Vision III), is holding a retreat to plan for the next three-five years in June that J. Alexander will attend, and is seeking money for additional hardware. The umd.edu connection to the Internet is changing July 1; proposals for new providers will be put out to bid. The system is cracking down on provision of Internet guest accounts. Some campuses provide guest accounts to alumni.

It was noted that UMUC can send a designee to CUSF meetings, since they are open meetings.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Schukoske, Secretary

**Draft Minutes of 15 June Meeting
University of Maryland System
Council of the University System Faculty (CUSF)
Minutes of the meeting of Thursday, June 15, 1995
Salisbury State University**

Present: McMahon, Chair; Alexander, UMCP; Arthur, CSC; Block, UMCP; Cohen, UMCP; Fox, SSU; Gill, UMBC; Glibert, CEES; Haight, TSU; Jagus, UMBI; Luchsinger, UB; Rebach, UMES; Schukoske, UB; Shamoo, UMAB; Smith, A., SSU; Smith, C., UMCP; Wallinger, FSU.

Guests: Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA; Trudy Somers, TSU; Ralph Blomster, UMAB.

Absent: Arnold, UMAB; Bambacus, FSU; Booth, UMAB; Bowles, BSU; Breslow, UMCP; Friedman, TSU; Goldman, UMAB; Johari-Courts, CSC; Langdon, BSU; Lasher, UMBC; Lomonaco, UMBC; Smith, R., TSU; Sternheim, UMCP; Talley, UMES; and Varghese, UMAB.

The meeting was called to order at 10:08 a.m. The Chair thanked Kathy Fox for making the arrangements for use of the facilities.

I. Welcome from Nelson Butler, Acting President/Provost: Kathy Fox introduced Dr. Butler, who reported highlights of the campus news and said that he knows that CUSF work benefits the students around the state.

Trudy Somers, TSU, and Ralph Blomster, SSU, introduced themselves as newly elected

council members who will take office in the fall.

II. Approval of the minutes of May, 1995: Corrections to the May, 1995 minutes were made:

Page 2: change "work" to "word" "research" or "scholarship"

Page 3: change "CBI" to "CBL" and change "Chesapeake Biological Institute" to "Chesapeake Biological Laboratory"

Page 6: Remove sentence with "cracking down" and add "UMATS has developed a policy that the campuses should restrict the granting of, and divest many current, guest computer accounts so that (i) the level of service to the primary campus users is not degraded, and (ii) so that campuses do not compete with commercial providers of internet access."

Motion made to accept the minutes as amended. Motion was seconded and passed.

III. Report of the Associate Vice Chancellor:

A. ART Document: A memo dated June 6, 1995 from John Anderson of the Office of the Attorney General was distributed.

B. Policy on Librarians: A 1991 draft policy was distributed. It is being sent to the presidents for approval.

C. General Education Core Curriculum: A revised draft from the Intersegmental Committee of Chief Academic Officers dated May 26 was distributed. It notes that to increase faculty input on this topic, the chairs of the CUSF and MHEC FAC are now invited to participate in the Committee.

D. Vision III: Helen Giles-Gee said the comments on research were taken into account. Further comments may be made until July 5.

E. Technical Preparation Committee: The committee is reviewing high school curricula to help better prepare high school students for college. There will be a newly formed task force on admissions to college. It was noted that there may be ways of tying in non-traditional methods of student assessment with student admissions; it will be important for CUSF have a representative on the committee.

Ira Block was on the Tech Prep committees on math (tech prep math is Algebra I & II) and on physics (tech prep physics can be met by non-traditional physics course). The committee is composed of representatives from four-year institutions, two-year institutions, and high schools. The trend is to count technical courses that students take.

IV. Council Chair's Report: The Chair thanked the CUSF members for their work during her time on the CUSF. She commented that at the June meeting of the Board of Regents Regent

Blount complimented CUSF for its work and timely responses. The Chair presented Certificates of Recognition to all CUSF members and UMS staff Helen Giles-Gee and George Marx.

MHEC FAC meeting minutes: A question was raised about the report in the minutes at page 2 where it says that UMUC has no representation on CUSF at present. The draft minutes are incorrect, since CUSF has not yet voted on a statement regarding UMUC's representation. However, it was noted that no member of the faculty from UMUC has been in attendance at the CUSF meetings since January 1995. The minutes of this June 15 CUSF meeting will be sent to Meg Ryan, who will correct the MHEC FAC minutes.

Executive Committee Minutes: There were questions about the paragraph on the Governor's Policy Statement. The statement is coming out June 15, 1995, and will probably be available on the internet tomorrow. The statement has been prepared by the Governor's staff, not UMSA. There were also questions about the section on "Budget" on page 2 regarding the areas of UMS enhancement priorities. It was noted that the enhancement areas were designated in the 1988 legislation and that the issue of enhancement priorities should be revisited in light of changes since 1988.

An article entitled "The Failure of Statewide Coordination" from The Chronicle of Higher Education (June 16, 1995) was distributed.

V. Vision III Discussion: Motion was made to remove the motion to table the discussion of Vision III. Motion seconded, and carried unanimously.

Motion made to reconsider the decision of CUSF not to respond to the most recent version of Vision III as a committee.

Motion made to move into the committee of the whole to discuss the motion to reconsider. Motion seconded. Motion carried. The language of the Ad Hoc Committee's draft letter was considered. Motion was made and seconded to come out of the committee of the whole. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion made to reconsider the decision of CUSF not to respond to Vision III as a committee was seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made to adopt the report of the committee of the whole. Ad Hoc Committee Chair Block will distribute the final wording for recommendations to the Chancellor to CUSF via e-mail. Chair McMahon and Ad Hoc Chair Block will incorporate suggestions as appropriate and send to the Chancellor by the July 5th meeting of the Chancellor's Council.

VI. Committee Reports:

A. Educational Policy: The Chair provided a brief committee in the absence of Committee Chair Lasher. The Regents Faculty Awards program was approved by the BOR. The chancellor will work out the details, and will inform CUSF. The ART document vote by the BOR will be considered at their August meeting.

B. Administrative Issues: J. Alexander presented two resolutions. Motion was made and seconded to adopt a:

Resolution on CUSF representation for UMUC.

Resolved:

1. CUSF recognizes the importance of the participation of UMUC, as a member institution of UMS, in deliberations of CUSF.

2. The CUSF Constitution calls for members to be full-time faculty elected by the faculties of their institutions. UMUC, having no full-time faculty, has no mechanism for representation on the CUSF.

3. Until such time as UMUC has full-time faculty, CUSF encourages UMUC to send an observer to CUSF meetings, which are open. CUSF resolves to extend all privileges of membership to such an observer, except that of the vote. Motion failed, 4-9.

Motion made and seconded that, the above motion having been defeated, it is unnecessary for the Chair to do anything further. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion made and seconded to adopt the following:

Resolution on domestic partner benefits.

Resolved:

CUSF recommends to the Chancellor that in matters pertaining to extending benefits to domestic partners of employees of UMS campuses that entail no cost to the UMS or State and that are local to each campus (example: library privileges), that UMS permit and encourage each campus, via its shared governance process, to develop and implement its own policy and practice.

Motion to table failed. Motion to adopt the resolution made, seconded and failed, 6-8. Motion to reconsider the resolution. Motion seconded, and carried, 10-4. Motion to table the motion to an unspecified date. Motion seconded, and carried, 16-0.

Motion to delete items #3 and 4 from the agenda. Motion seconded and carried.

VII. Unfinished Business

A. Proposal for Strengthening Faculty Input to Regents' Decisions

Questions previously raised by the CUSF about the alternate proposal for faculty input, that a non-voting representative from CUSF be present at BOR meetings, were raised with UMSA. The Executive Committee reported the following responses:

(1) Vice Chancellor Marx noted (at the May meeting) that there are two types of executive session at the BOR, ones at which the presidents are present, and ones at which the presidents are absent. It was the Chancellor's sense that a CUSF representative could be present when presidents are present provided the UMS presidents were in agreement. Since the Chancellor had not broached the subject with the presidents he did not know how it might be received. The Chancellor felt that either the chair, vice chair, or immediate past chair would be the appropriate CUSF representative. However, no designate could be allowed.

(2) The Chancellor noted that at BOR committee meetings, a CUSF representative could participate at all committee meetings. The representatives on committees, with the exception of Educational Policy, could be other than the CUSF chair, vicechair or immediate past chair.

(3) The Chancellor said that if CUSF agrees to the alternate proposal, CUSF is agreeing to a moratorium on the introduction of a Faculty Regent Bill. CUSF discussion noted that the Council composition changes somewhat each year, so that CUSF cannot bind future CUSF members indefinitely, but that it operates in good faith.

Regarding the Faculty Regent Bill in the 1995 legislative session, what passed in the Senate was one voting faculty member, what passed in the House was one non-voting faculty regent and one non-voting staff member.

The Executive Committee report included the above three points as qualifiers of the proposal from the Chancellor. Motion made and seconded to support the proposal from the Chancellor for the advisory role with the Regents with the exception that the CUSF cannot commit future Councilors' actions on faculty regent bills. Motion seconded, and carried 10-4.

Substitute motion made that the chair shall thank the Chancellor and Regents and but communicate that "CUSF reconfirms its support for 1995 Senate Bill 207 (one non-voting faculty regent), thanks the Board of

Regents and the Chancellor for its support of Senate Bill 207 and trusts that they will continue to support such a bill in a future legislative session." Substitute motion was seconded. Substitute motion failed.

Motion to approve the motion as amended was made and seconded. Motion carried, 14-1.

VIII. New Business

A. New Secretary-Designate of the Maryland Higher Education Commission: It was suggested that the incoming CUSF Chair invite the Secretary-Designate to meet with Council in early fall.

B. Statewide Coordination: It was suggested that the new CUSF Educational Policy Committee be urged to consider the size of the UMSA (staff of approximately 94) and its handling of faculty input.

IX. Thanks: The incoming chair thanked M. Jane McMahon for her excellent work as Chair, and thanked Timothy Haight and especially Secretary Jane Schukoske who rotate off the CUSF for their service on the Council.

Motion to adjourn was made at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Schukoske, Secretary

University of Maryland System
Council of University System Faculty
Minutes of Wednesday, September 13, 1995
University of Maryland Baltimore County
As Approved November 13, 1995

Present: Cohen, Chair, UMCP; Alexander, UMCP; Arthur, CSC; Block, UMCP; Booth, UMAB; Breslow, UMCP; Chapin, UMES; Fox, SSU; Freimuth, UMCP; Friedman, TSU; Gill, UMBC; Glibert, CEES; Havas (Alt.), UMAB; Langdon, BSU; Lasher, UMBC; Lomonaco, UMBC; Luchsinger, UB; McClive (Alt.), FSU; Rebach, UMES; Shamoo, UMAB; C. Smith (Alt), UMCP; R. Smith, TSU; Somers (Alt.), TSU; Sternheim, UMCP; Strain (Alt.), BSU; Wallinger, FSU.

Guests: Dr. Helen Giles-Gee, Dr. George Marx, Dr. Freeman Hrabowski, Dr. Joane Argersinger, Dr. James Grubb.

Absent: Bambacus, FSU (excused); Goldman, UMAB (excused); Jagus, MBI;

Johari-Courts, CSC; McMahon, TSU (excused); Montgomery, UMCP; Schukoske, UB; Shear, UMAB; A. Smith, SSU;

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 AM. .

I. Welcome from Dr. Freeman Hrabowski, President; Dr. Joan Argersinger, Provost; and Dr. James Grubb, University Senate President: Dr. Hrabowski expressed pride in the UMBC campus and CUSF representatives. He noted a 25% increase in the number of freshmen, a third of them with SAT's above 1200; a diverse student body with average SAT's above 1100; National Research Council data showing more awards per faculty member than either UVA or Chapel Hill. Dr. Argersinger noted that UMS will continue to face challenging issues such as workload, shared governance and periodic review, and thanked CUSF for assuring that such issues are addressed by the faculty. Dr. Grubb noted the difficulty of campus senates reacting to issues in a timely manner, applauded the CUSF intent to be proactive on critical issues, and said campus leaders are supportive of CUSF actions and efforts.

II. Approval of the minutes of June 15, 1995:

Corrections to the June, 1995 minutes were made:

Page 1: Change Booth, UMAB, from "absent" to "present," and change affiliation for Blomster from "SSU" to "UMAB."

Page 3: Amend "remove the motion to table the discussion of Vision III," to read "remove from the table consideration of Vision III." Amend the Educational Policy Committee section to read "brief committee REPORT in the absence..."

Motion made to accept the minutes as amended. Motion was seconded and passed.

III. Campus Liasons:

The following liaison to campus senates/forums were identified:

BSU-Langdon, CSC-Arthur, FSU-Wallinger, SSU-Fox, TSU- McMahon, UB-Schukoske, UMAB-Shamoo, UMBC-Lasher, UMES-Rebach, CEES-Glibert, UMCP-Alexander.

IV. Report of the Vice Chancellor:

A. Educational Policy Proposals: Dr Marx distributed a draft of the Tentative Agenda for the September 21 meeting of the BOR Committee on Educational Policy. He briefly discussed each of the following and noted that they illustrate the process and scope of UMS policy enactment. He further noted the expectation that the academic vice presidents will have discussed the issues with campus senates before the System acts on the policies, and that CUSF can play a role in assuring this expectation is fulfilled.

1. UMS/MSDE/MHEC K-16 Partnership for Learning: There is a proposal for a commission that would incorporate participation by higher education in the determination of appropriate preparation of high school graduates. Currently, MSDE determines graduation requirements and higher education determines

admission requirements.

2. Proposed UMS Policy on Librarians: The proposal was described as an attempt to establish a uniform personnel policy whereby librarians would be assigned a quasi-faculty status with job security rights.
3. Proposed UMS Policy on Family Leave for Faculty: The history of the proposal was recounted, including the point that a draft had been distributed earlier.
4. Proposed UMS Policy on Off-Campus Programs: The intent of the policy is to assure tuition and fees are the same as for on-campus students.
5. Proposal to Establish a Department of Women's Studies in the College of Arts and Humanities at UMCP: In answer to a question, the distinction was drawn between new programs, which require MHEC approval, and new departments, which are internal UMS structural issues.

B. FY '97 Budget: Dr. Marx distributed portions of the UMS FY 1997 Budget Presentation to the BOR Finance Committee, and noted the following general features:

1. There is a new process of four-year funding planning designed to provide stability, integrate strategic plans and set priorities.
2. System "Investment Priorities" have been established, and will be addressed in the four-year cycle: Undergraduate Education; Info., Telecomm., & Interactive Tech.; Faculty/Staff Dev. & Training; Competitive Faculty Salaries; Technology Transfer; Regional Education Centers; and Research & Graduate/Professional Education. Institutions were asked to set priorities within these categories.
3. Only UMS will receive a General Funds increase over FY '96. Two scenarios are a 3% CPI (\$17,000,000) and a 3% CPI + 2% (\$28,000,000).
4. State, institutions and students will share increases in operating costs.

Two overriding issues with financial impact were identified:

1. How to achieve parity. It was noted that there are thirteen different perspectives of parity.
2. Interpretation of legislative intent regarding Mandated Enhancements. It was noted that different terminology was used relative to enhancements for HBI's and UMCP than for other enhancements like "Undergraduate Education" and "Competitive Faculty Salaries."

Considerable Council discussion followed. Issues and questions raised included: Concern and displeasure with \$3,000,000 proposed for UMUC. Statements included expressed outrage that UMUC is receiving funding when they are now in violation of MHEC "Minimum Requirements for Degree Granting Institutions," questioning the \$.3 million for faculty development when UMUC has no full-time faculty, and protest that, in comparison, some campuses will receive insignificant amounts. Dr. Marx responded that UMUC students are the only ones in the System receiving no support, that the Regents had unsuccessfully set UMUC funding as a high priority for three years, and that there had been legislative insistence that UMUC be a high priority. It was suggested that, in light of the history of

several issues, members individually should address legislators and regents. A question was asked about the link between system support for faculty salaries, unfunded mandates, and campus discretion. Dr. Marx replied that there is very little discretion within the unfunded mandates section. It also was suggested that CUSF ask for an allocation for faculty salary improvement be built into the budget process.

Concern was expressed about the inequity of funding faculty salary improvement at some campuses while not funding others farther from the target percentiles.

C. Report of the Associate Vice Chancellor

Dr. Giles-Gee distributed several written reports of groups in which system faculty had a role.

1. Statement of Expectations (Freshman Writing), developed to clarify the English component of the CAO response to the MHEC guidelines for state-wide General Education.
2. Update on General Education Requirements: UMS was informed that the proposed "TITLE 13B - General Education and Transfer" would NOT be included on the agenda for the September 14 meeting of the MHEC Education Policy Committee. However, the full MHEC is scheduled to take action on "TITLE 13B" at the September 28 meeting, and written comment might be requested and oral testimony might be permitted for that meeting. The CAOs have recommended that the term "graduation requirements" and all references to upper division requirements be deleted from the policy.
3. Final Report of Committee on Graduate Faculty Participation: The Committee recommended the establishment of a UMS Interinstitutional Graduate Faculty to facilitate reciprocal recognition of graduate faculty status between UMS institutions and broader sharing of faculty expertise across the system.
4. Draft of Transfer Mediation Committee Procedures: The proposal sets out procedures for resolving disputes among associate and baccalaureate degree granting institutions regarding articulation and transfer.
5. Conference on "Changing Role of the Department Chair": The conference will be held at the Cross Keys Inn, October 27-28, 1995, and will utilize a workshop format. More than eighty UMS chairs will participate, with selection of participants made by the institutions. A request was made to provide the benefits of the workshop to the chairs who are unable to participate.
6. General Education Implementation Committee: Subcommittees are working to resolve implementation issues. Of particular concern is the definition of "continuous enrollment."

V. Council Chair's Report:

A. Written Report

The Chair distributed a draft copy of the minutes of the August 28, 1995 Executive Committee meeting and written reports of the August 9 Chancellor's Council meeting, the August 25 Board of Regents meeting, and the September 5 BoR Finance Committee meeting.

Chancellor's Council: Concern was expressed regarding Vision III and the management of a proposed 20% enrollment-increase goal, implications of a threat to tenure and departmental structure, and the source of funding for new cooperative initiatives.

Board of Regents: The Board approved in principle a proposal to establish a "Faculty Advisor" position and charged the Bylaws Committee with writing a bylaw to implement the proposal. The Board reaffirmed the existing Affirmative Action policy.

Finance Committee: The meeting addressed FY '97 budget priorities and tuition. (See attachments to Chair's report for details.) The CUSF Chair requested that some of the \$3,000,000 designated for UMUC be used for faculty salaries, but no committee support was granted.

B. BOR Faculty Advisor

It was noted that the designation "Faculty Advisor" was a downgrading from other terms like Faculty Regent, that acceptance of the proposal does not prohibit CUSF from seeking a legislative approach at some later date, and that the Attorney General's Office recommended to the Board that CUSF (not BOR) designate the Faculty Advisor. As proposed, the faculty advisor would have a voice in executive sessions in which the presidents participate, and a non-binding "show of hands" vote in Board sessions.

Motion was made to designate the Chair of the Council of University System Faculty as the Faculty Advisor to the Board of Regents. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

VI. Committee Reports:

A. The Chair circulated sign-up sheets to express preferences for the following committee assignments:

Faculty Development, Educational Policy, Administrative Issues, Finance, Nominations, Legislative Affairs, and an "Issues" committee that proactively will address a limited number of special concerns.

B. Administrative Issues

The Chair of the Administrative Issues Committee introduced and explained the possible revisions of Article III of the CUSF Constitution concerning: (1) changing the office of Vice-chair to Chair-elect, (2) optional Executive Committee membership limitations designed to achieve diversity of institutional representation, and (3) Executive Committee term limits. It was noted that since the three issues are interwoven, and that since the committee did not reach consensus on recommendations, the Administrative Issues Committee sought Council direction. A motion was made, seconded and approved to move to Committee Of The Whole to discuss the issues.

Council returned to order from Committee of the Whole. The Administrative Issues

Committee Chair announced that the committee would consider the discussion and return a revised proposal at an undetermined later date.

C. Legislative Affairs Committee

The Legislative Affairs Committee chair reported on a meeting of the Maryland Senate Budget and Taxation Committee, Subcommittee on Higher Education. (See written Chair's report for specifics.) The Committee chair asked whether Council wished to provide guidance on several issues surrounding funding of UMUC.

VII. Unfinished Business:

A. VISION III: The following revisions were suggested: Remove the references to faculty as "purveyors of knowledge" from later sections, as was done in the section attributed to CUSF, and changing the term "research" to "research/scholarship" throughout.

"Considerable discomfort" was registered on two items. There was an objection to the establishment of "system-wide teams" in light of an existing bureaucracy and in the absence of a system of checks and balances. There was concern that only cosmetic changes would be permitted and a request for analysis of the implications of that restriction.

VIII. New Business:

A. Conference on "Changing Roles of the Department Chair" will be held October 27-28, 1995, at Cross Keys Inn, Baltimore. Because of the expense, campuses will select those attending.

B. Senate/Forum Chairs/Presidents Meeting will be held October 21, 1995, at UMCP. Materials for the meeting have been sent. Any suggested additions to the agenda should be sent to the Chair, Joel Cohen. A question was raised about inviting MHEC representatives. The answer was that it would be inappropriate since this is an "in-house" UMS meeting.

C. Motion was made to send letters of appreciation to departing administrator and welcoming letters to new administrators in UMS institutions. Motion was seconded and passed.

D. Motion was made to place approved CUSF minutes on World Wide Web. Motion was seconded and passed. It was noted that membership and e-mail lists are already on WWW. Members were encouraged to send home page addresses to Carl Smith, UMCP.

IX. Motion to adjourn was made at 2:50

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Wallinger

University of Maryland System
Council of University System Faculty
Minutes of the Meeting of Monday, November 13, 1995
Towson State University
Approved December 14, 1995

Present: Cohen, Chair; Alexander, UMCP; Arthur, CSC; Block, UMCP; Blomster, UMAB (Alt.) Booth, UMAB; Chapin, UMES; Ennis, UMCP; Fox, SSU; Friedman, TSU; Freimuth, UMCP; Gill, UMBC; Glibert, CEES; Goldman, UMAB; Langdon, BSU; Lasher, UMBC; Lomonaco, UMBC; Luchsinger, UB; McMahon, TSU; Montgomery, UMCP; Rebach, UMES; Shamoo, UMAB; Shear, UMAB; A. Smith, SSU; C. Smith (Alt), UMCP; R. Smith, TSU; Somers (Alt.), TSU; Sternheim, UMCP; Strain (Alt.), BSU; Wallinger, FSU.

Guests: Secretary of Higher Education, Dr. Patricia Florestano; Dr. Helen Giles-Gee; Dr. George Marx; Dr. Hoke Smith, Dr. Michael O'Pecko .

Absent: McClive (excused), Breslow (excused), Freimuth (excused), Jagus, Ramchander (excused).

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

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. SEPTEMBER 13, 1995 MINUTES: A motion was made, seconded, and passed to approve the minutes as submitted.

B. OCTOBER 10, 1995 MINUTES: The minutes were corrected to list Alan Smith, McMahon and Goldman as "Present," and to change Johari-Courts to Ramchander as the Councilor for CSC. A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the minutes as amended.

II. COUNCIL CHAIR'S REPORT

The Chair distributed a written report, accompanied by copies of his comments to the MHEC Educational Policy Committee, made on behalf of MHEC FAC; correspondence to the Chancellor regarding the System-wide Advisory Councils; and draft Minutes of the October 21 meeting of the Executive Committee and the Presidents/Chairs of UMS Faculty Senates/Forums. The chair reported that the Chancellor's Council discussed, but took no action on, System Council's

proposal; that the Chair of CUSS supported the CUSF position opposing reduced UMSA support for CUSF; and that the Shared Governance proposal was distributed, but not discussed.

In response to a question about the common calendar, it was noted that the current common calendar is not in compliance with COMAR regulations, and that the Chancellor's Council voted to support an academic year that starts before Labor Day, ends before Memorial Day, and includes a mini-session of at least three weeks. The AAAC is discussing the question of a 3 or 4 week mini-session, and will decide the actual dates for the calendars.

III. REPORT BY VICE CHANCELLOR GEORGE MARX

A. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE: The November agenda includes final consideration of the Sexual Assault Policy and the beginning of a review to assure quality in UMS Business and Life Science programs. UMSA also intends to inform the Regents of trends in transfer student enrollments and recent changes in General Education which impact the quality of UMS graduates. In response to a question regarding perceived lower quality of our graduates, Dr. Marx indicated the likelihood of some kind of measure of student learning outcomes as part of accountability. Dr. Marx also noted the interrelated nature of faculty productivity, workload, accountability, and curriculum issues, and indicated the need to address them in light of Vision III goals and the ongoing "K-16 Partnership In Learning" discussions of high school graduation requirements, and the need for remediation at the collegiate level. Other topics noted were concern about the affordability of education and recent BOR reaffirmation of the Affirmative Action Policy.

B. VISION III: Dr. Marx reported the decision by Presidents Council to form three "Coordinating Committees" from currently intact groups: the Vice Presidents for Development will coordinate achievement of the increased funding goal; the Presidents Council has responsibility for the enrollment goal; and the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Vice Presidents for Administration and Finance will be charged with responsibility for their respective areas of productivity improvement. The three committees will be charged with establishing procedures that incorporate input from staff, students and faculty. The "most problematic" issue involves defining productivity and setting benchmarks. In response to a question about the decision-making authority of the "coordinating committees," Dr. Marx indicated that since it is necessary to discuss the issues in the context of System goals, the committees would identify indexes of productivity, such as graduation rates, but the specific benchmark and goal would be determined by the individual campuses. Specific charges to the committees will be provided by November 17, and the entire action is expected to "come to fruition" by March 20, 1996.

C. FOUR YEAR FUNDING PLAN: Dr. Marx reported considerable discussion in various councils, but no consensus concerning specific changes. The plan will go to the BOR in January with very few changes. In response to a perceived shift from a bottom-up development of the plan, Dr. Marx indicated that a partial shift had been made in order to incorporate the Regent priorities, and because many future budget decisions will be made on a political basis.

D. OTHER: Dr. Marx reported that an MHEC Academic Affairs Advisory Council had been created as a means of including all segments of higher education in discussion of those issues. In response to a request for advice on a method of CUSF involvement in the "K-16 Partnership in Learning," Dr. Marx said it may be appropriate for CUSF to send a representative to the UMSA "working group" chaired by Joanne Argersinger.

IV. WELCOME

Dr. Hoke Smith, President of Towson State University, welcomed the Council. He suggested that assessment and accountability will continue to be major issues, and that a faculty voice is crucial in addressing legislators since bodies such as CUSF may have more credibility than the presidents. Dr. Smith also said that his motivation for proposing that Towson and Bowie absorb a disproportionate share of the projected enrollment increase was to raise a policy debate on the issue before the increase occurred, and to plan for accommodation without diluting the quality of education. In response to a question regarding renaming the UMS institutions "University of Maryland at . . .," Dr. Smith said he opposed it since it brought no benefits, and that if he had a choice, he preferred Towson University.

V. REMARKS BY DR. PATRICIA FLORESTANO, SECRETARY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Dr. Florestano said she accepted the Secretary position because she saw the opportunity to do something for higher education in the administration of a Governor who truly understands its culture and is supportive.

Dr. Florestano announced the development, during 1996, of a new state plan of goals and objectives for higher education to replace the current, outdated plan.

She said the plan needs to assure responsiveness to the needs of the state, provide a full range of academic programs, prevent excessive expensive duplication, and assure access by citizens in all parts of the state. According to Dr. Florestano, the plan must be based on the new economic realities, including: an economy that has not yet bounced back; federal cutbacks in aid to higher education; increasing enrollments, without significant accompanying funding increases; a labor-intensive program, with highly paid faculty whom some

believe need to do more teaching and less research; the spiraling cost of higher education that has the potential to deny access to some students; continued demand for accountability; and increasing pressure to assist the business world and economic development.

Dr. Florestano identified a number of issues of concern in development of the new state plan.

1. Higher Education Funding: Governor Glendening has repeatedly said the goal is stability of funding and wants to provide a 3% increase on a continuing basis. The question is what procedure to use to provide stability. According to Secretary Florestano, the Governor also has suggested the need to carefully examine new programs, to concentrate on the programs we do best, and to eliminate needless duplication.

2. Minority Education: The complex of unresolved issues includes the means of achieving diversity, other-race scholarships, and enhancement of the historically black institutions.

3. Distance Learning: While interactive video networks can reduce the distance barrier, it also poses a number of problems, such as expense, and a number of unresolved questions, such as appropriate allocation of resources, assigning credit, extent of ubiquitousness, and faculty development.

4. Accountability: Dr. Florestano affirmed the appropriateness of accountability reporting, and said Governor Glendening believes in the need to measure outcomes, rather than processes. An intersegmental committee has been working on development of a format for one comprehensive report that would be submitted to the legislature once a year.

5. Teacher Education: An MHEC task force has recommended new approaches which emphasize more substance, while delaying methods and pedagogy till later in the program. The Commission has declined a 5th. year requirement. Instead, the State Department of Education and MHEC are funding pilot projects as incentives to try new approaches.

6. Remedial Education: Dr. Florestano reported that MHEC is attempting to refine the reporting process in order to obtain better data on the amount of remedial education done at different types of institutions.

In response to a number of questions and comments, Dr. Florestano provided the following observations, among others:

-- Since the private and independent colleges and universities fill a gap in higher education, and since they are very influential in the legislature, it is inappropriate from political and policy perspectives to challenge legislative funding for them.

-- Dr. Florestano declined to predict the MHEC decision on UMUC's request for a

waiver from the minimum-number-of-faculty requirements. The UMUC request was based on claims of a unique mission, level of legislative funding and a "wave of the future" model for delivery of educational services.

-- While the recent Gen. Ed. changes are intended to facilitate transferability, MHEC policy is to encourage unique campus missions, not homogeneity, in Maryland higher education institutions.

-- Dr. Florestano sees a role for faculty in "educating" legislators, and intends to incorporate full, non-confrontational, faculty participation in development of the new state-wide plan for higher education.

-- No decisions have been made by either MHEC or UMS regarding accommodating projected enrollment increases.

-- MHEC currently is considering hiring a consultant to assist studying the complex of issues surrounding HBI enhancement. Unresolved questions include methods of meeting diversity mandates, Morgan State University enrollment and funding, and other-race scholarships, among others.

-- While MHEC has consistently opposed legislative scholarships, Dr. Florestano sees no political value in urging the legislature to change the policy more quickly than they seem inclined to do so in response to other pressures.

VI. VICE CHANCELLOR'S REPORT (continued)

A. CHAIRS WORKSHOP: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed and summarized the results of an evaluation of the Department Chairs Workshop. She indicated that the format was seen as an improvement over last year, that notebooks were being sent to the campuses for distribution to chairs who were unable to attend, and that the Academic Vice Presidents were being asked whether to make it an annual event.

A motion was made to charge the Chair to send a letter to AAAC urging continuation of the workshop as an annual event, and asking the Vice Presidents for a commitment of time and funding for the event. The motion was seconded and passed, with one abstention.

B. SECONDARY - HIGHER EDUCATION TASK FORCES: Dr. Giles-Gee asked Jay Alexander to report on two System task forces on which he serves. One task force is examining admission requirements for the system. There likely will be recommendations that institutions can and should have admission requirements over and above UMS minimum requirements, and that an individual who meets the minimum requirements should be granted access somewhere in the System. Other subcommittees are examining questions of transfer students, GED's, foreign students, and other factors in a complex operation.

Another task force, under the direction of Dr. Giles Gee, is charged with responding to a request from the high schools for input in decisions regarding the institution of performance-based graduation requirements. The new

graduation requirements possibly could become part of the higher education admission requirements. Currently, four groups of "content experts" are working to define minimum competencies in the areas of Mathematics, English, Social Studies, and Science. The point was made that these groups are separate from the disciplinary groups defining "core knowledge" for General Education courses at the higher education level.

VIII. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

A. SHARED GOVERNANCE: The Chair reviewed the history of the original UMSA "Discussion Paper" and the "Proposed Policy Statement on Shared Governance in the University of Maryland System," which incorporated revisions suggested at the October Senate Chairs meeting. The intended procedure is to submit a revised CUSF version to the campuses for discussion, reexamine the proposal at the January Senate Chairs meeting, take final action at the February CUSF meeting, and submit the final proposal to the March Chancellor's Council meeting.

Council discussion focused on the distinctions among "shared governance," "advisory capacity," "participation in decision making," and "decision-making authority" as appropriate descriptors of the faculty/staff/student role, and the question of appropriate processes and procedures for ensuring administrative compliance with the advisory/participatory actions. The view was expressed that, since only the presidents have legal authority and responsibility for decision making, disclosure and justification for departure from advisory body recommendations was necessary. A suggestion was made to include requirements that, in instances of disagreement, the administrative body provide written justification for the contrary decision, that the advisory body be allowed to respond in writing, and that both documents become part of the official record of the institution.

A motion was made and seconded to amend Item 1 of the Proposed Policy Statement, incorporate Item 4 into Item 1, and renumber the subsequent Items. Following several suggested revisions, the amended Item 1 (revisions in upper case) would read:

"1. Each UMS institution and major unit of each institution shall have procedures and structures in place which provide for APPROPRIATE collaboration between and among administration, students, staff and faculty. THESE PROCEDURES SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED BY THE APPROPRIATE ELECTED BODIES OF THE STUDENTS, THE STAFF, AND THE FACULTY PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION. The structures and procedures for the decision-making process shall be developed cooperatively, disseminated widely PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION, and reviewed periodically." The expressed intent of the motion was to encourage a collaborative process,

rather than one in which advisory bodies react to administrative proposals, and to assure participation by all parties without imposing a particular organizational structure on UMS institutions with differing decision-making structures and procedures.

A motion was made and seconded to table the motion to amend Item 1 until such time as the Executive Committee provided specific language incorporating the previous suggestions. The motion to table failed on a 10-to-10 tie vote.

The motion to amend Item 1 was passed.

Additional suggested changes should be sent to Larry Lasher for incorporation into a revised Executive Committee draft that would be presented at the December Council meeting.

It was suggested that if the Proposed Policy Statement is approved without a requirement binding administrative compliance with advisory-body recommendations, CUSF would implicitly endorse a policy which allows such a practice.

A motion was made and seconded to delete Items 6F and 6H of the Proposed Policy Statement. The motion failed.

B. FOUR YEAR FUNDING PLAN: The Chair noted that any suggested revisions need to be advanced quickly because the proposal is scheduled for action at the December Chancellor's Council meeting. Clarification of the various percentages and dollar amounts was provided. No Council action was taken.

C. PERIODIC REVIEW OF FACULTY: The System task force charged with drafting the BOR policy is approaching the conclusion of its work, and a draft of the proposed policy should be available for the December CUSF meeting. The policy was characterized as including the following features:

- It is consistent with the CUSF Statement of Principles.
- All tenured faculty will participate.
- The review should be formative rather than summative.
- It shall be conducted as a process of collegial assessment with an emphasis on peer review, utilizing a set of written criteria.

- One fifth of the faculty shall be reviewed on a rotating basis every five years, with other factors, such as unsatisfactory annual merit reviews, triggering more frequent assessment.
- The faculty member is the primary provider of review materials, and provision is made for record keeping and appeals processes.
- The policies must be consistent with principles of academic freedom.
- In instances of unsatisfactory reviews, procedures for remediation must be

instituted.

- The review does not, by itself, constitute sufficient grounds for termination.
- The process shall not duplicate existing policies and procedures.
- There must be a faculty development program, and strong evaluation

The draft policy will be submitted simultaneously to AAAC and CUSF, be reviewed by the Attorney General's office and, hopefully, be submitted to the Board of Regents for action at the March meeting.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS

A. FACULTY SALARIES: It was moved to approve a previously distributed Administrative Affairs Committee resolution urging the Chancellor and the Board of Regents to achieve the BOR policy that the mean faculty salary at each UMS institution be at least in the 85th percentile of the salaries of that institution's Carnegie class, and that the Chancellor and the Regents give priority to eliminating salary discrepancies among the various institutions.

A motion was made, seconded and passed to amend paragraph three of the resolution to delete the phrase "within budget constraints," and insert stipulations for creating a plan by a date certain.

A motion was made, seconded and passed to include the phrase "each institution's Carnegie class" at appropriate places in paragraph four.

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTION AS AMENDED:

"The major strength of any organization is its human capital -- the people who work there. This truism is perhaps most valid for institutions of higher education. The institutions of the University of Maryland System can reach the first ranks of public higher education institutions only by attracting and retaining faculty of the first rank.

In order to attract and retain faculty of such quality, the Board of Regents has set as policy that the mean faculty salary at each UMS institution should be at least in the 85th percentile of the salaries of that institution's Carnegie class.

CUSF urges the Chancellor and the Regents to recognize the deleterious effects continuing salary degradation have on the quality of the University of Maryland System, and to make every effort to realize the Board of regents policy by creating a plan whereby the mean faculty salary of each UMS institution shall be at least in the 85th percentile of the salaries of each institution's Carnegie class by 2002.

CUSF further urges the Chancellor and the Regents to give priority to eliminating salary discrepancies among the various institutions of the System via allocation of funds reserved for parity in achieving the Regent's policy of mean salaries at the 85th percentile of each institution's Carnegie class. Actions taken by individual institutions in internally reallocating funds to address salary issues should be considered internal institutional matters, and should not figure in System calculations of parity."

The resolution, as amended was passed.

B. ACHIEVING THE VISION III - PRODUCTIVITY: It was moved to approve an Administrative Affairs Committee resolution to recommend to the Chancellor to institute a deliberate, widely-representative process to define "productivity."

The following revisions of the distributed draft were accepted:

-- Paragraph 2, line 5-6: Add the term "CUSF."

-- Paragraph 2, line 6: Change "...UMS can, indeed..." to "... can UMS, indeed . . ."

-- Paragraph 3, line 6: Add to the last sentence the phrase "such as in the model used for development of policies on Faculty Workload and Periodic Review of Faculty."

TEXT OF THE AMENDED RESOLUTION:

"Achieving the Vision III," recently adopted as policy by the Board of Regents calls for a "20% increase in productivity" in the University of Maryland System over the next 5 to 7 years. "Productivity" is undefined. Indeed, later in the policy, it is acknowledged that "academic productivity" has not been meaningfully defined, and declares that the UMS will be a leader by developing a meaningful definition.

Any meaningful definition of "academic productivity" of an institution of higher education, and/or of its faculty, must be carefully designed to reflect the manifold missions of the institution, and it can only succeed as an indicator if all members of the institution believe in it. With, and only with, a full, inclusive process, based on the CUSF principles of shared governance, can UMS, indeed, develop a truly valid definition of "academic productivity."

Accordingly, CUSF recommends to the Chancellor that a careful, deliberative process be instituted, first to develop the principles upon which a definition should be based, and second to develop the definition itself. Such a process should involve all levels of the UMS community, from system administrators to individual faculty, with continuous discussion and feedback among all levels, such as in the model used for development of policies on Faculty Workload and Periodic Review.

The motion to approve the resolution, as amended, was passed.

IX. EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

The Chair and other members of the Executive Committee reviewed comments made by the Chancellor at the Senate Chairs meeting, suggesting an intent to establish criteria and procedures for including faculty input in the evaluation of the presidents. The Senate Chairs suggested that projected policy should include evaluation of vice presidents and deans. The Chair urged all councilors to gather data on the current process and procedures for evaluation of administrative officers on their campuses and report back to CUSF at the December meeting. It also was suggested that the Chair obtain information on current UMSA practices.

X. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair of the Faculty Development Committee reminded Councilors that the Chancellor has allocated \$10,000 for system-wide faculty development projects. Application requirements and RFP forms were distributed in the mailing for the November meeting. The deadline for RFP submission is March 31, 1996.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Wallinger

University of Maryland System
Council of University System Faculty
Minutes of the Meeting of Thursday, December 14, 1995
Bowie State University
Approved, as amended February 12, 1996

Present: Cohen, Chair; Alexander, UMCP; Arthur, CSC; Block, UMCP; Booth, UMAB; Breslow, UMCP; Chapin, UMES; Ennis, UMCP; Fox, SSU; Glibert, CEES; Goldman, UMAB; Jagus, UMBI; Langdon, BSU; Lasher, UMBC; McClive, FSU; McMahon, TSU; Ramchander, CSC; Rebach, UMES; Shamoo, UMAB; C. Smith (Alt), UMCP; Somers (Alt.), TSU; Sternheim, UMCP; Strain (Alt.), BSU; Wallinger, FSU.

Guests: Dr. Helen Giles-Gee; Dr. George Marx; Dr. Pollard, President, BSU.

Absent: Friedman, TSU (excused); Freimuth, UMCP; Gill, UMBC; Lomonaco, UMBC (excused); Luchsinger, UB; Montgomery, UMCP; Shear, UMAB; A. Smith, SSU; R. Smith, TSU (excused).

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

I. WELCOME

Dr. Pollard, President of Bowie State University, extended a welcome to the Bowie campus, and expressed appreciation for the work performed by CUSF.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made, seconded, and passed to approve the minutes of the meeting of November 13, 1995, as submitted.

III. COUNCIL CHAIR'S REPORT

A. Written Report: The Chair submitted written reports of the November 21 BOR Educational Policy Committee meeting, the November 21 MHEC Faculty Advisory Council meeting, and his prepared comments to the December 1 Board of Regents Meeting.

B. BOR Faculty Advisor: The Chair reported that the Regents approved the Faculty Advisor Bylaw. As passed, the Faculty Advisor is a non-voting representative, is allowed to "participate exactly as any member of the Board of Regents," and takes part in any executive sessions open to the presidents. The Chair noted that discussion occurring in executive sessions must remain confidential until it is aired in a public session. The view was expressed that the absence of a vote and the secrecy of executive sessions constituted a reason for continued efforts to achieve full regent status. The Chair acknowledged the view, and added that he anticipates significant benefit from unrestricted participation in discussion in BOR meetings.

C. Chancellor's Council: The Chair reported considerable disagreement among the presidents regarding the Four-Year Funding Plan. Disagreement reportedly is focused on the amount of funds allocated to the categories of Parity, Flagship Enhancement, HBI Enhancement and "Baltimore Area" Graduate Center, and the definition of "Baltimore Area." In response to a question regarding the likelihood of legislative approval of the 3% increase, the Chair said the presidents seem to be operating on the assumption that it would be approved.

IV. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

A. Minutes and Correspondence: The Chair distributed copies of a draft of the November Executive Committee Minutes and correspondence to the Chancellor implementing CUSF resolutions regarding Shared Governance and the definition of "Productivity" in the Vision III Policy.

B. Periodic Review of Faculty: Discussion was initiated, but suspended to accommodate the Benchmarking presentation.

V. "PILOTING IN SHOAL WATERS" BENCHMARKING REPORT

A. Introduction: The Chair introduced Ms. Carol Berthold, Special Assistant to

the Chancellor. Ms. Berthold introduced the presentation as a project that started as an attempt to arrive at an objective way of determining Peer Groups, and evolved into a "Benchmarking" process or tool. She drew a distinction between Peer Groups (institutions similar in missions, scope and characteristics) and Benchmarking Groups (defined as more broadly similar, as operationalized in the report). Ms. Berthold said she would cover the procedure for choosing a Benchmark Group for institutions, and, then explain how "we would use it if institutions decide they want to adopt this." Ms. Berthold said the title was chosen because she intended to present it at national conferences, and because of the metaphorical connection to Nathaniel Bowditch's definition of piloting: "navigation involving frequent or continuous determination of the position or a line of position relative to geographical points, to a high order of accuracy." At a later point Ms. Berthold said the intent was to present the project to the Board of Regents as an informational item in February.

B. Purpose: Multiple issues facing higher education were identified as the need for comparisons of UMS institutions with other public 4-year institutions with broadly shared characteristics, such as breadth of programs and commitment to research and graduate education. Ms. Berthold noted that the intent was inter-institutional comparison, not comparison within the System. Three reasons for comparison were listed: to help administrators improve performance, to assist accountability efforts, and to facilitate communication, or "telling our story."

C. Method of Choosing Benchmark Group: The method involves a 7-step procedure:

- Start with appropriate Carnegie group.
- Select input and output measures
- Rank institutions
- Calculate percentiles
- Average input and output percentiles separately
- Graph input versus output averages
- Choose smaller Benchmark Group

At several points in the presentation, Ms. Berthold noted that the data used in the study was restricted to publicly available published information, because no funds were available to conduct surveys and because she is "a staff of one."

She also noted frequently that the available data and measures were most appropriate for Research Institutions, and the need for improvement of input and output measures and data for Masters I universities.

1. Input Measures were provided for Students (acceptance rate, % freshmen with 3.0 GPA, SAT/ACT scores, % freshmen with AP credit); Faculty (% full time, % with terminal degrees, student-faculty ratios, faculty salary, % who teach only); and Expenditures (student-related expenditures and institutional support expenditures).

2. Outputs Measures were provided for Student Success (% entering professional and graduate study, % freshmen graduating in 5 years); Federally-financed R&D Expenditures; Faculty Awards; Faculty Recognition; Student Recognition; Success of African-American Students; and Degrees Awarded per \$1 million of E&G Expenditures.

3. Data Calculation begins with calculation of a percentile ranking for every institution on each input and output measure. Averages of input measures and output measures are calculated and graphed on separate axes.

4. Identification of a Benchmark Group is achieved by drawing a circle around an institutionally-selected set of coordinates. Size of the benchmark group is determined by the length of the radius. Characteristics of the Benchmark group can be varied by selection of different coordinates for the center of the radius.

D. Use of Benchmark Group: Ms. Berthold said the graphs are not intended to be the benchmarks on which institutions are measured. The method simply provides a way of seeing which institutions are clustered together. Within the selected benchmark group, an institution can select "Strategic Indicators" (e.g. tuition and fees as % of revenues, ratio of FTE students to FTE faculty, etc.), set a target/benchmark for each dimension, update data annually, and evaluate progress toward the benchmark or set a new benchmark.

E. Claimed Advantages and Disadvantages: Ms. Berthold identified advantages as objectively chosen groups, flexibility, dynamic accommodation of progress and aspirations, variability of group size, and availability of data. Disadvantages listed were: Outputs for Masters I universities could be better. Data are sometimes 1 or 2 years old. Data are missing for a few measures for some institutions.

F. Council Reaction: Councilors expressed multiple suggestions, objections and concerns, including the following:

-- % of graduates getting a job ought to be included as an output measure of student success. (Response: National data is not available.)

-- Restricting data base to that which is nationally reported and published is a serious flaw since it can produce very precise and accurate measures of meaningless numbers. (Response: No resources are available to gather other data.)

-- The data base ought to include part-time versus full-time enrollment, and transfer versus native students.

-- There is a need to account for 5-year programs that include graduate study.

-- Several suggested including additional faculty awards.

-- It is preferable to expand the African-American students measure to "Minorities" and to consider it as both an input and an output measure.

-- Several suggested additional sources of data.

-- An institution with few, full time, poorly paid faculty will falsely appear

to be better than other institutions. (Response: The original purpose of the graph is not to say one institution is better than another, only to draw the circle to identify the benchmark group.)

- Several Councilors expressed fear that, regardless of intent, others would draw faulty conclusions about the comparative quality of institutions.
- Provisos need to be included, indicating that this procedure does not provide a measure of quality of an institution.
- Several Councilors requested clarification of the distinction between Peer Groups and Benchmark Groups.
- Reliance on 2-year-old data is a serious flaw in an era of rapid change.
- There are no measures of institutional quality included.
- There are no measures of the teaching function, thus redefining faculty role.

(Response: Does that mean we should not do this for the measures for which data are available?)

- In spite of intent, this process easily could be used inappropriately by the legislature as a measure of faculty productivity.
- Several Councilors expressed serious reservations about presenting the project to the Board of Regents, as early as February, prior to revision and refinement.

G. Council Action:

A motion was made and seconded to charge the Executive Committee to urge the Chancellor to withhold any further distribution of "Piloting in Shoal Waters" until after further discussion and refinement. Council discussion centered on the questions of abandonment versus refinement of the project; irrelevance for comprehensive universities; inappropriate selection of input and output measures; uses of the information for other than intended purposes; methodological problems; and the image of CUSF rejection prior to closer analysis.

A substitute motion was made, seconded, and progressively editorially amended and passed. As amended, the motion was:

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

VI. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (Continued)

A. Periodic Review of Faculty (continued): The Educational Policy Committee Chair introduced "Draft 4" of the proposed "Policy on Periodic Review of Faculty," and suggested this was the appropriate time for CUSF input to AAAC for revision.

1. A motion was made, seconded and approved without objection to amend Item #8 (line 88) to substitute the term "development" for the term "remediation."
2. UMAB councilors relayed a suggestion from the UMAB Faculty Senate to remove the terms "by itself" and "sufficient" from Item #9 (line 93). If accepted, the first sentence of Item #9 (lines 93-94) would read: "A periodic review does not constitute grounds for termination of a faculty member."

Arguments in favor of the change were: Retaining the terms suggests a function of periodic review is to initiate termination proceedings. It was suggested that the absence of specific criteria for "meets expectations" constituted unacceptable ambiguity of the grounds for termination proceedings. It was suggested that, in the present form, it is contrary to AAUP guidelines since it may violate academic freedom and establishes additional grounds for termination beyond standards of incompetence, negligence and moral turpitude.

Arguments opposing the change were: The presence of the terms prevents the use of periodic review, alone, as the basis for initiating termination proceedings, and deletion of the terms makes periodic review irrelevant to such proceedings. Institutional policies and BOR policies are not countermanded by this document. It also was suggested that this wording was suggested by the campus Senate Chairs/Presidents, previously had been approved by CUSF, and was considered very carefully in conferences with AAAC. It was suggested that, when read in its entirety, the proposed policy is summative and focused on development, rather than being a punitive policy, and that Item #4 provides for the establishment of specific criteria for assessment. It was suggested that retaining the terms prevented the use of student evaluations as the sole criterion for assessment of teaching. It was suggested that deletion of the provision that consecutive annual assessments of "not meeting expectations" triggers periodic review (lines 73 - 75) would reduce the significance of objections to the terms in Item #9.

There was considerable discussion of the meaning of the term "meeting expectations." One view was that it referred to institution-specific criteria and standards of assessment. Another view was that it referred to departmental expectations specified in faculty workload forms. Another view was that it is a generic term to refer to poor performance.

3. A motion was made and seconded to amend the last sentence of Item #5 (lines 73 - 75) to read: "Two consecutive annual reviews that indicate a faculty member has performed in an incompetent and inefficient way, and has not discharged the duties of his or her position, shall trigger the periodic review, regardless of rotation."

A two-part substitute motion was made and seconded to:

- (a) Amend Item #4 by inserting the phrase "the expectations of" in line 67. As amended, the second sentence of Item #4 would read "Institutional policies

and procedures shall be consistent with the preservation of academic freedom and shall include specific criteria to assess those areas of THE EXPECTATIONS OF faculty performance over time."

(b) Amend Item #5 by deleting the sentence (lines 73 - 75) "Two consecutive annual reviews that indicate a faculty member is not meeting expectations shall trigger the periodic review, regardless of rotation."

A motion was made, seconded and passed to move the previous question on the substitute motion.

The motion to insert the phrase "the expectations of" in Item #4 was passed.

The motion to delete the last sentence of Item #5 was passed.

The substitute motion was passed by a vote of 13 in favor, 7 opposed.

4. A motion to delete the terms "by itself" and "sufficient" from Item #9 failed by a vote of 9 in favor, 10 opposed.

5. A motion was made and seconded to amend Item #8 to include a faculty advocate in discussions of development plans and to provide for a signed agreement. As amended, Item #8 would read(amendments in upper case): " If a faculty member's performance is judged as not meeting expectations, a specific development plan shall be worked out among the dean, department/unit, the individual faculty member, AND AT THE FACULTY MEMBER'S DISCRETION, A FACULTY ADVOCATE, in conjunction with the faculty development program and resources at the individual campus. This plan shall include a procedure for evaluation of progress at fixed intervals. THERE SHALL BE AN AGREED UPON STATEMENT SIGNED BY ALL PARTICIPANTS TO SERVE AS A WRITTEN RECORD OF THIS MEETING."

The motion passed by a vote of 11 in favor, 6 opposed.

6. A question was raised regarding the omission of "the chair" in Item #8. It was reported that the omission was intentional. No action was taken.

7. The motion on approval of "Draft 4, University of Maryland System Policy on the Periodic Review of Faculty," as amended, passed.

VII. REPORT OF THE ASSOCIATE VICE CHANCELLOR HELEN GILES-GEE

A. Faculty Workload: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed copies of the legislatively required "Report To The Joint Chairs Of The Senate Budget And Taxation Committee And The House Appropriations Committee on The Workload of the UMS Faculty," and highlighted several features, including the following:

-- This report meets the Joint Committee request for additional data on number

of faculty meeting or exceeding standards and the share of faculty effort devoted to instruction, research and service.

- Increased instructional productivity, as reflected in an increase of 158 course units taught, and a decrease of 106 core and full-time faculty.
- The percentage of exceptions is less than the number of faculty teaching overloads.
- Future reports will include an analysis of contact hours.

In response to a claim that the method of reporting and calculating overestimated the potential productivity, Dr. Giles-Gee said the reporting format was specified to UMS, and that the suggested revision would be relayed to the Department of Fiscal Services.

B. Performance Accountability: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed copies of the "Report of the MHEC Intersegmental Workgroup on Performance Accountability," and said it was the result of attempts to consolidate accountability reports. The Chair said he would relay any comments to the Chancellor and to the MHEC FAC. Council reactions included the following, among others:

- There are no references to benchmarks and it seems light on criteria for research and scholarship.
- The quality performance indicators for faculty make little or no reference to teaching, and thus seem to redefine the role of faculty.
- If teaching indicators are included, MBI and CEES need to be reported separately.
- The purely quantitative and monetary approach to measuring research is inappropriate.
- Indicators of state support for higher education should be included.
- There are no indicators of the service component.
- Diversity indicators should include all minorities, rather than only African-Americans.

C. Vision III Productivity Indicators: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed copies of a draft of productivity measures which had been sent to AAAC, and indicated that Academic Vice Presidents were to be discussing it on campuses, suggesting additions and revisions, and submitting reports of implementation plans by March 20. CUSF action will be invited after a more definitive draft is produced. One comment was that, as measured, as productivity is increased, instructional quality will decrease.

D. Enrollment Projection Process: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed copies of a report detailing the UMSA procedure for projecting enrollments, projected enrollment increases, and recommendations. Dr. Giles-Gee noted that enrollment growth is targeted for institutions in the geographic regions of greatest student-population increases, and that capital budget adjustments/increases will be similarly targeted to those institutions.

E. Four-Year Funding Plan: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed copies of a November 27, 1995 Draft of the UMS "Four-Year Funding Plan, FY 1998 - FY 2001," and noted FY 1997 reallocations; changes in allocations to parity, enhancements, and a Center for Research and Graduate and Professional Study in the Baltimore Area; and anticipated adjustments for institutions targeted for significant (>25%) enrollment growth.

F. Articulation and Transfer: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed and summarized a draft of MHEC policy governing articulation and transfer between accredited colleges and universities, and Maryland secondary schools & non-regionally accredited post-secondary schools. She noted that the policy is on the MHEC Ed. Policy Committee February agenda for gathering comment. Reportedly, the intent is to set standards to govern current practices. UMS will continue opposition to unilateral imposition of acceptance by a receiving institution based on acceptance by a previous receiving institution.

G. General Education: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed and summarized an October 24, 1995 draft of "General Education Implementation Guiding Principles." In response to queries, she clarified the procedures for challenging questionable standards of a transferred course, and noted that there are continuing discussions of the issue of differences in performance by native and transfer students.

H. Graduate Faculty: Dr. Giles-Gee announced that the proposal to establish a UMS Graduate Faculty had been approved by the Chancellor's Council and will be forwarded to the BOR Educational Policy Committee. The intent of the policy is to make any UMS graduate faculty member available to graduate students from other UMS institutions.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Systemwide Councils: The Chair briefly summarized the UMSA-proposed reduction of support for CUSF and optional methods of providing sufficient support for the Executive Committee.

B. Shared Governance: Discussion was focused on the CUSF-revised draft of the "Proposed Policy Statement on Shared Governance in the University of Maryland System," which reflects Council action taken at the November CUSF meeting.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously passed to amend Section 4 by substituting "consultation with elected representative bodies" for "collaborative dialogue," and by adding provisions for written statements of objection to a president's decision. As amended, Section 4 would read (changes in upper case): The presidents of institutions shall seek CONSULTATION WITH REPRESENTATIVE BODIES OF faculty, students and staff as appropriate and will

report regularly to the Chancellor on policy and procedures in place to achieve that dialogue. THE REPRESENTATIVE BODY MAY, IF IT CHOOSES, PRESENT A WRITTEN STATEMENT OF ITS POSITION AND/OR ANY OBJECTIONS TO THE ADMINISTRATION'S POSITION. THIS WRITTEN STATEMENT WILL BECOME PART OF THE INSTITUTION'S RECORD ON THIS ISSUE.

Objections were made to the absence of criteria in Section 5, F for the "rare occasions" when administrators must act without benefit of consultation, and to the absence of a provision for administrative reporting on those occasions. The Executive Committee was charged with recommending wording to address those objections.

Dr. Giles-Gee asked what CUSF expectations were, regarding progress of the proposal, and questioned the propriety of CUSF generating a shared governance policy without collaborative consultation with the other Councils. In response, it was noted that the CUSF draft differs very little from the Chancellor's policy proposal, that the intent was to forward this draft to the Chancellor's Council for consideration in March, and that CUSF has no authority to convene a meeting of representatives of the Staff and Student Councils.

C. Evaluation of Administrative Officers: The chair briefly reviewed the Chancellor's request for input on the question of faculty participation in evaluation of administrative officers. Councilors from eleven institutions reported practices on their campuses, ranging from full faculty participation in the evaluation of all officers through the level of chairs, through beginning development of a procedure, to complete absence of faculty input. In the majority of institutions, evaluation was reportedly a top-down process.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. A question was raised regarding the impact of the common calendar on faculty earning power. It was suggested that the councilor refer the question to the Administrative Affairs Committee.

B. An objection was raised to the complete absence of UMS consultation with CUSF prior to promulgation of major decisions affecting the system as a whole. Examples given were the \$50 million for a Virology Institute, and the possibility of some form of "privatization" of the UMAB Medical School. A request was made to refer the issue to the Educational Policy Committee to generate a procedure for addressing the Chancellor regarding the absence of consultation. The Executive Committee was charged to take the issue under advisement.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 P.M.
Respectfully Submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

University of Maryland System
Council of University System Faculty
Minutes of the Meeting of Monday, February 12, 1996
Coppin State College
Approved as Amended, March 12, 1996

Present: Cohen, Chair; Alexander, UMCP; Arthur, CSC; Block, UMCP; Chapin, UMES; Ennis, UMCP; Fox, SSU; Goldman, UMAB; Havas, UMAB; Jagus, UMBI; Lasher, UMBC; McMahon, TSU; Ramchander, CSC; Rebach, UMES; Shamoo, UMAB; C. Smith (Alt), UMCP; Somers (Alt.), TSU; Sternheim, UMCP; Strain (Alt.), BSU; Wallinger, FSU.; Lomonaco, UMBC; Luchsinger, UB; A. Smith, SSU; R. Smith, TSU;

Guests: Dr. Giles-Gee, UMSA; Dr. Howard, Vice President Academic Affairs, CSC; Dr. Burnett, President, CSC; Dr. Joanne Boughman, Provost, UMAB.

Absent: Booth, UMAB (excused); Breslow, UMCP (excused); Glibert, CEES; Langdon, BSU; McClive, FSU (excused); Freimuth, UMCP; Gill, UMBC; Montgomery, UMCP; Shear, UMAB;

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

I. WELCOMING MESSAGES

Dr. Arthur, Chair of the CSC Senate extended welcome to the campus and introduced Dr. Howard, Vice President for Academic Affairs. Dr. Howard welcomed Council to the "oasis" of the Coppin State College campus, suggested the breach between administration and faculty was needless since we are engaged in the common pursuit of service to students, and said he looked forward to a continuing strong relationship with CUSF. At a later point, Dr. Burnett, CSC President extended his welcome, expressed condolences to the Salisbury Councilors for the loss of Dr. Bellavance, and assured Council that Dr. Cohen truly represented CUSF in Chancellor's Council meetings.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. The Minutes of December 14, 1995 were amended to list R. Smith and S. Lomonaco as excused.

B. A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the minutes as amended.

III. COUNCIL CHAIR'S REPORT

A. Written Report: The Chair referred Council to the written report included in the mailing and called attention to the MHEC FAC opposition to the

UMUC request for a waiver of the requirement that 50% of all courses be taught by full time faculty. Opposition is based on classification of the teaching personnel as administrators, who serve at the pleasure of the president and do not enjoy the benefits of academic freedom. Although the MHEC Ed. Policy Committee approved the waiver request, FAC will continue opposition, arguing that, minimally, the teaching personnel should be classified as faculty, with full faculty rights. A final decision is scheduled for the February 15 MHEC meeting.

B. Chancellor's Council: The Chair reported that Chancellor's Council briefly discussed revisions of the proposal to reduce UMSA support for the CUSF Executive Committee at the February 5 meeting. The presidents informally agreed to provide a portion of the support for CUSF. Reportedly, Vice Chancellor Marx will propose a continuation of support for an eleven-course load reduction, at a total of \$2,500 per course. UMSA would provide \$1,800 per course, and the president of the Executive Committee member's institution would provide \$700 per course.

C. Nominating Committee: The Chair reminded the Nominating Committee of the need for progress in producing a slate for the upcoming elections.

D. Dr. Bellavance: The Chair noted the death of Dr. Thomas Bellavance, President of Salisbury State University, and said he would send a letter of condolence from CUSF.

IV. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

A. Benchmark Report ("Piloting in Shoal Waters"): The Chair elaborated on discussions of the Benchmarking Report with the Chancellor, as reported in the Minutes of the December 18 Executive Committee meeting and the Draft of the Minutes of the January 27 Senate/Forum Chairs meeting. The Chair reported that the Chancellor seems amenable to modifications, including incorporation of a "higher dimensional" model to replace the 2-dimensional input/output model, and weighting of selected indicators. In response to a question regarding outside review by experts (e.g. statisticians), the Chair and Dr. Giles-Gee indicated that it was being submitted to outside groups. A question was asked whether the MHEC Accountability Report and this benchmarking report are connected. Dr. Giles Gee replied that it is likely that MHEC will require benchmarks, but allow UMS to specify them.

B. New Paradigms for the Classroom: The Chair referred Council to the Barr and Tagg article, "From Teaching to Learning," noted prior discussion by the Executive Committee and Senate/Forum Chairs, said the Chancellor believed any initiative on the issue must come from the faculty, and invited Council discussion. It was suggested that new paradigms should be initiated on the

campuses, not in CUSF. It also was noted that this is not "cutting edge" material, and that the major problems involve assessment and inclusion in accountability reporting.

A motion was made, seconded and passed to send the issue to the Senate/Forum Presidents/Chairs for discussion by appropriate bodies on the campuses and, at their discretion, reporting back to CUSF.

In further discussion of the issue it was noted that:

--If UMS intends to move in this direction, it is entirely appropriate for CUSF action.

--It has been recommended as a focus for the 1996 Department Chairs Workshop.

--Work by Scott Cowens at Case Western is an excellent source of information.

--Given the movement toward outcome-based evaluation, the issue goes far beyond the way courses are taught and removing administrative barriers. There are major implications for measuring productivity and allocation of resources.

A motion was made seconded and passed to charge the Educational Policies Committee to consider the "Paradigm Change" and to report to the Council as to the necessity of a CUSF and/or System position on the question.

V. REPORT BY ASSOCIATE VICE CHANCELLOR HELEN GILES-GEE

A. Life Sciences in the UMS: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed copies of "Report to the Chancellor on the State of the Life Sciences in the UMS" and the Chair introduced Dr. Joann Boughman, UMAB, Chair of the Task Force that developed the report.

Dr. Boughman reviewed the history of the project, noting that there was full faculty involvement, thorough analysis of the self studies by external reviewers, and an emerging pattern of cooperative ventures by several institutions. The Final Report and recommendations have received the approval of the AAAC and the Presidents Council, and have been presented to the BOR Educational Policy Committee and the Board of Regents.

The Report includes seven recommendations:

1. All UMS undergraduate life sciences majors should have access to a research or intern experience prior to graduation, and there ought to be interinstitutional efforts to provide those experiences.
2. The Chancellor should appoint a Systemwide task group to propose steps for improved recruitment and retention of minority students and faculty, especially in programs beyond the medical professions.
3. The Chancellor and the presidents need to develop implementation plans to ensure that laboratories are provided, equipped and maintained with modern instrumentation and equipment.

4. All UMS undergraduates ought to participate in a life sciences course in order to develop a citizenry that is informed on science and technology issues.
5. UMS graduate programs should pay full-time graduate students competitive stipends and give placement preference to the best UMS undergraduates.
6. UMS should carefully pursue economic development partnerships, especially in disciplines that support environmental sciences and biotechnology. The Task Force also recommends establishment of at least four endowed chairs to enhance pure and applied research.
7. There ought to be annual reports on institutional progress toward implementing the recommendations.

Council reactions were varied and generally positive. It was noted that full commitment to implementation would significantly impact resource allocation for other programs. It also was noted that the report envisioned a significant shift from the norm of undergraduate life sciences programs driven by a pre-med requirements. In response, Dr. Boughman said that medical school curricula are changing in response to rapidly changing conditions. In response to queries about the feasibility of public-private partnerships, Dr. Boughman said that careful, cautious development of such partnerships provided the opportunity for funding the improvements in an era of scarce state funding. In response to the observation that the report does not contain a rationale for reallocation of resources, Dr. Boughman said that was deemed to be a campus issue, beyond the purview of the committee, and that System encouragement of public-private partnerships offered a partial alternative. In response to a question about coordination with community colleges to fill the private-sector demand, Dr. Boughman noted that this was a UMS task force, and that new bio-tech. firms are demanding personnel with bachelors and masters degrees to set up and run their labs.

B. "Privatization" at UMAB: Dr. Boughman agreed to briefly present the UMAB perspective on the issue, noting immediately that they preferred to avoid the term "privatization." She said that, in comparison to the other UMS institutions, different forces drive UMAB. For example, she noted that 30% of funds come from patient services, 30% from grants and contracts, and smaller amounts from tuition and state support. She also noted significant differences in UMAB's structure and operational procedures. Consequently, UMAB is looking at alternative models to provide necessary flexibility in dealing with capital and operating budgets, including one whereby UMAB would be a public university, but separate from UMS. When asked whether that model would become the reality, Dr. Boughman said that some changes would occur, but that the specific changes was still an open question.

V. LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

The Chair introduced Frank Komenda who reported on pending and proposed legislation affecting UMS.

A. Early Retirement: At the direction of Chancellor's Council, UMSA officials entered into discussions with the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee regarding the "inadvertent" exclusion of faculty from SB1. Three changes were seen necessary for application to faculty: The retirement window needed to be adjusted from July-to-October, to a January-to-August window in order to accommodate semester scheduling. There needed to be an exception to the severe penalty for somebody who is rehired after taking early retirement to accommodate completion of research grants and to meet potential personnel shortages. In light of the anticipated 20% enrollment growth, the loss of 60% of the retiree positions and funds would be intolerable for UMS institutions. The legislators reportedly were reluctant to rewrite SB1 to accommodate faculty, for fear that all other agencies would demand similar rewriting. Instead, the legislators reportedly recommended crafting an entirely new bill specifically for faculty, or all UMS personnel, or for all of higher education. At this point, the intent is to introduce such a proposal for consideration in 1997, and to amend SB1 to completely exclude UMS personnel from the current proposal. Reportedly, the Senate committee is willing to sponsor and support such legislation next year.

A question was asked regarding the feasibility of moving back to a system of step increases for faculty similar to the system for classified employees. The response was that it is very unlikely, since the state is moving away from step increases to a pay-for-performance system.

B. Public - Private Partnership Act: The act is intended to facilitate partnerships by eliminating the current exemption procedures required by the State Ethics Commission. The argument is that the lengthy (15-to-18 months) procedure has a chilling effect on both faculty and the private sector companies. The proposed legislation would mirror the new federal regulations which permit application to a per group and relegate enforcement to institutional presidents. Without the changes, Maryland public institutions would be at a competitive disadvantage since most other states have already eliminated the duplication.

C. Collective Bargaining: Mr. Komenda doubts the collective bargaining bill will be enacted, in light a division within the ranks of labor and the Department of Fiscal Service estimate that the bill would cost the state \$32 million to \$40 million per year.

D. Faculty Regent: Mr. Komenda reported that Senator Ruben has introduced an identical bill to last year's proposal for two voting faculty regents, and that, in light of the recent creation of the BOR Faculty Advisor position, UMSA intends to testify against it. The Chair of the CUSF Legislative Policy Committee recommended that CUSF take no position on the bill. Council discussion reiterated the points that CUSF has not made a commitment to the BOR to oppose legislation establishing a faculty regent, and that BOR is aware of

our position.

E. Relations With Legislature: Mr. Komenda said that relations with the Legislature have never been better. He attributed it to the hard work of faculty, UMSA, and regents in telling the story of UMS excellence.

VI. NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

The Chair of the Nominations Committee recommended the following procedure for election of officers for 1996-97:

1. Candidates for Chair will be announced at the March meeting, and they are invited to submit brief position statements on their vision of CUSF and their role as chair. Election of the Chair would occur either at the April or May CUSF meeting.
2. Following election of the Chair, the committee would submit a slate of candidates for the remaining Executive Committee members, with elections probably taking place at the May meeting.

After checking the by-laws, the final schedule will be distributed to the membership via e-mail.

VII. REPORT BY THE ASSOCIATE VICE CHANCELLOR

A. MSBE Core Learning Goals: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed copies of the Chancellor's and her testimony before the Maryland State Board of Education regarding the State Core Learning Goals for high school students, and summarized the recommendations of the four UMS Faculty Review Committees.

1. The Science review team concluded that "students who master the competencies within this framework should be prepared for college-level work."
2. "As a result of the high school Core Learning Goals, the UMS [English] Faculty Review Committee has recommended a change in the UMS admissions requirement to include [oral] language skills -- as well as writing and reading -- as essential for collegiate work across disciplines."
3. The Social Studies review team noted that ". . . the Core Learning Goals lack a chronological framework centered upon the philosophy that relevant fields of history should undergird all social studies courses . . ." and recommended curriculum strategies to provide integration and advanced study.
4. The Mathematics review team noted that ". . . if the mathematics Core Learning Goals remain unchanged, students who master only knowledge and skills required in algebraic concepts' and 'geometric concepts' will not be prepared to engage Algebra 2 and entry-level college mathematics courses."

Dr. Giles-Gee also noted that if the K-16 initiative is to be successful, there needs to be major input from UMS faculty, and that the service component of faculty workload needs to be examined to determine appropriate and sufficient

incentives. To that end, she distributed copies of an Indiana University report, "Draft Report: IUPUI Task Force on Service."

Council reactions included a concern that the K-16 label suggested a progressive downgrading of the baccalaureate degree; a request for clarification of the English review-team recommendations; the need to distinguish between high school graduation requirements as necessary, versus sufficient, conditions for college entrance; and the fear that the initiative would erode the power of UMS institutions to set their own admission requirements. The point was reiterated that K-16 Partnership initiative offered an opportunity for UMS to have an impact in determining sufficiency of college preparation and that UMS institutions do, indeed, retain authority to set admission requirements.

B. Productivity Indicators: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed copies of "Proposed Definitions of Required Vision III Productivity Indicators" and noted the expectation of campus discussions and responses. Council reactions included an objection to the sole measure of research in terms of dollars, with no reference to quality; the fear that the complete absence of reference to quality means the indicators will be misused in many dimensions to the detriment of quality of education; the observation that the list completely omits any reference to teaching; and that these indicators are measures of activity, not productivity. In response to a question Dr. Giles-Gee said objections and suggestions should be sent to Ruth Robinson, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

The Chair charged the Issues Committee to address the issue, and asked for suggested replacement or new indicators which do measure productivity as we wish. Input should be addressed to Steve Rebach, Chair of the Issues Committee.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Shared Governance: The Chair reviewed the history of CUSF consideration and noted that the proposal will be on the March Chancellor's Council agenda and on the April BOR agenda. It was noted that the Chancellor agreed to take shared governance into account in the evaluation of presidents.

A motion was made, seconded, and passed unanimously to adopt the "Proposed Policy Statement on Shared Governance in the University of Maryland System," as presented.

B. Periodic Review: The Chair noted that the proposal, with suggested CUSF changes, will be forwarded to AAAC for further consideration.

A motion was made, seconded and passed to amend the first sentence of Section 5 by deleting the words "tenured" and "five," and changing "years" to

"year."

Council discussion addressed the new Section 7, as adopted at the January Senate/Forum Chairs meeting. It was noted that the intent was to make the document less negative or punitive in tone. Concern was expressed that the change gave the policy even more all-encompassing power in the determination of merit, pay and promotion decisions. No action was taken.

A suggestion was made to revert to the original language of Section 1, with application of the policy only to tenured faculty. Reactions included the comments that the review requirement ought to apply to faculty who have been employed for many years, but are not tenured and may not have ever been reviewed; that this was the most important change of all to combat the image of tenured faculty as a protected class; and that, since students do not distinguish between full-time and part-time faculty, the policy should apply to all faculty. No action was taken.

A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the "Draft Policy on Periodic Review of Faculty," as amended.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. Legislative Committee Report: Council received the Legislative Committee report, including:

1. A recommendation that CUSF not initiate action supporting or opposing SB252 (change in conflict of interest laws), but that, if asked, individuals should support it. One reaction was that CUSF, as "grass roots" organization, ought not take a position.

2. A recommendation that we support HB199, revising sick-leave policy. No action was taken.

A suggestion was made in Council that CUSF ought to oppose efforts to move toward a state pay-for-performance system, since there have been significant problems in determining methods of assessing performance. It was noted that an effect of such an approach would be to eliminate COLA's. One reaction was that CUSF ought not oppose a concept of merit-based pay. No action was taken.

B. UMS Consultation re UMAB Privatization: Dr. Shamoo summarized his memo on the issue which was distributed with the agenda mailing, and emphasized the point that he was not addressing the merits of either Privatization or \$50 million for a new virology institute. He said his concern was the absence of any consultation with CUSF prior to undertaking major projects with significant implications, such as siphoning large resources from the UMS allocation. He said that the lack of consultation was counter to principles of shared governance.

A motion was made and seconded to direct the Ed. Policy and Admin. Issues Committees to study the issues of privatization of UMAB and establishment of the Virology Institute. Following friendly amendments, the motion of the floor was: "CUSF directs the Educational Policy Committee and Administrative Issues Committee to study the issue of privatization for the entire UMS. The Educational Policy Committee shall provide a framework to guarantee academic freedom and tenure. The Administrative Issues Committee shall provide a framework for guarantees of health benefits, pensions, and employment contracts."

One reaction was that this was a local UMAB issue rather than a System issue, and that it ought to be addressed by the UMAB faculty council before being brought to CUSF for action. A response was that what happens to faculty at one institution has implications for all UMS faculty. Another reaction was that this is an issue of shared governance, and falls within the purview of CUSF responsibility to advise the Chancellor.

A substitute motion was made, seconded and passed to refer the issue to the Executive Committee for consideration of how Council might best address the question.

X. CHANGES IN ORDER OF BUSINESS

Councilor McMahon went on record requesting formal motions and the need for consensus before changing the order of business. She said the consultation issue should have come up earlier when there was time for a longer discussion.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

Council of University System Faculty
Minutes of the Meeting of Monday, March 12, 1996
University of Maryland at Baltimore
Approved, as Amended, April 10, 1996

Present: Cohen, Chair; Arthur, CSC; Block, UMCP; Booth, UMAB; Chapin, UMES; Ennis, UMCP; Fox, SSU; Goldman, UMAB; Havas, UMAB; Jagus, UMBI; Lasher, UMBC; Luchsinger, UB; McClive, FSU; McMahon, TSU; Ramchander, CSC; Rebach, UMES; Shear, UMAB; A. Smith, SSU; Somers (Alt.), TSU; Strain (Alt.), BSU; Wallinger, FSU.

Guests: Dr. Giles-Gee, UMSA; Dr. Ramsay, President, UMAB.

Absent: Alexander, UMCP (excused); Breslow, UMCP (excused); Freimuth, UMCP; Glibert, CEES (excused); Langdon, BSU; Lomonaco, UMBC (excused); Montgomery, UMCP; Shamoo, UMAB (excused); R. Smith, TSU (excused); Sternheim, UMCP (excused);

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

I. WELCOMING MESSAGES

A. Dr. Havas, President of the UMAB Senate, extended a first-time welcome on behalf of the 1,200 faculty. He noted that UMAB does not have a strong tradition of shared governance, but that, as President, Dr. Ramsay brought a sense of stability and was working with the faculty to develop and implement shared governance at UMAB. He noted that the faculty are awakening to the fact they can make a difference.

B. Dr. Ramsay welcomed Council, noting that UMAB was the founding school of the University of Maryland. He said that, given his background at Oxford University and the University of California, it was difficult not to have a strong feeling for shared governance, and that while the potential for gridlock exists, all can work as partners.

Dr. Ramsay also reviewed UMAB financial-support data. He said UMAB receives approximately \$100 million in state support; that UMAB generates over \$1 billion in business, including over \$114 million in practice-plan revenues; and that 19% of clinical-faculty salaries comes from state appropriations. He said that dramatic changes in the health care industry, such as a shift toward managed care, have repercussions, but that UMAB was coping.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Amendments to Minutes of the March 12, 1996 meeting: Dr. Joanne Boughman, Provost, UMAB was added as a guest. Spelling for Dr. Bellavance was corrected. The term "develop" was added to IV, A, 4.

B. A motion was made, seconded, and passed to approve the Minutes of February 12, 1996, as amended.

III. COUNCIL CHAIRS' REPORT

The Chair distributed copies of his report and elaborated on several items.

A. Domestic Partners: The Chair summarized the hearings held by the Ad Hoc Regents Committee on Domestic Partners. The Committee, composed of the chairs of the Staff, Student, and Faculty Councils, two presidents and two

Regents, is scheduled to decide final committee recommendations on March 26, present recommendations to the Board of Regents at the April meeting. If action is recommended, the BOR vote would occur at its July meeting.

B. MHEC Waiver for UMUC: On February 15, MHEC approved a UMUC request for a waiver of the requirement that 50% of courses be taught by full time faculty. UMUC claims as faculty approximately 55 people, classified as administrators in the IPED report to MHEC, who teach six courses per year. MHEC Faculty Advisor Council opposed the waiver and sought official UMUC classification of those people as faculty.

The Chair read a letter from Dr. Ted Kariotis. In light of the revised ART document, he proposed reinstatement of the "Academic Directors" as full time faculty, with the following conditions:

1. All academic directors teaching six courses per year should once again become bona fide full time faculty.
2. They should receive annual contracts with the rank of Lecturer.
3. They should receive their present salary.
4. They should teach six courses per year and keep their present administrative duties, similar to those of department chairs.
5. They should use the time sheet all full time UMS faculty are using.
6. They should be represented with one vote on CUSF.

The Chair proposed writing a letter to the UMUC President, Dr. Massey, urging implementation of Dr. Kariotis' proposal, and if he declined, asking the BOR to address the issue. In response to a question of whether the UMUC "faculty" had requested action from Dr. Massey, the Chair noted that, as administrators who serve at the pleasure of the President, they may have no official vehicle for doing so. Dr. Giles-Gee urged addressing the Chancellor first. Others suggested the need for input from more than one person from UMUC before proceeding, and that it is inappropriate for CUSF to address the UMUC President. It also was noted that CUSF has seen fellow faculty wronged and done little to help them, and that the least CUSF should do is send a letter of support.

A motion was made and seconded to: "Request the Chair of CUSF to determine the level of support for the request made by Ted Kariotis, and to bring back this information to the CUSF for consideration for follow-up to the Chancellor to support their faculty/administrators."

Dr. Cohen relinquished the Chair to Dr. Wallinger in order to participate in debate.

Council discussion included the following points:

-- Given the facts that six people previously have been fired, that they have been stripped of one piece of their academic freedom, and that they have

justified fears of non-confidentiality, a poll of the UMUC "faculty" is impractical.

-- A past difficulty in responding was the lack of a request for a concrete action. Since we now have such a concrete request, we cannot back down and we must not delay for another month.

-- To accept Ted Kariotis' proposal would be to condone Dr. Massey's original view of the status of university faculty, and since a one-month delay would not significantly affect their situation, it is best to investigate further before proceeding.

-- This whole approach trivializes the position we have previously taken regarding the spectrum of issues regarding faculty rights and roles, such as shared governance, curriculum determination and academic freedom.

-- Since there seems to have been an amendment to the MHEC waiver, directing the BOR to investigate further, this ought to be addressed at the Regents level, with the Chair, as Faculty Advisor, participating in the discussion and educating the Regents regarding the spectrum of issues involved.

A substitute motion was made and seconded: "The Council directs the Chair to explore the issue raised here by Ted Kariotis and earlier by Al Whiting's supposed amendment with the Board of Regents, and report back to CUSF on sense of the Regents on this question."

Discussion focused on the meaning of the term "explore," with the suggestion that the Chair, as Faculty Advisor to the Regents "educate" the BOR regarding the issues involved in academic freedom. The Chair said that if the motion passes he would seek input from Council, then begin by discussing the issue with the Chancellor in the next Executive Committee meeting, discuss the issue with the Chairs of the Ed. Policy Committee and the BOR, and address the issue in his formal presentation to the BOR. One suggestion was to separate the issue of tenure from the UMUC issues.

Council approved the motion as a substitute for the main motion, and unanimously approved the motion per se. Subsequent discussion addressed the appropriateness and timing of raising the tenure issue.

C. Periodic Review: Copies of the "Proposed Policy on Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty," as revised by AAAC, 3/5/96, were distributed. According to the cover memo, the proposed policy will be considered at the May 6, 1996 Chancellor's Council meeting and is tentatively on the BOR Education Policy Committee May 21, 1996 agenda. The Chair reviewed several differences from the CUSF draft approved at the February Council meeting:

1. Section 1 reverted to the restriction to tenured faculty, omitting application to all fulltime faculty, tenured and non-tenured.
2. Section 5 reinstated the sentence "Two consecutive annual reviews that indicate a faculty member is not meeting expectations shall occasion a new

periodic review, regardless of rotation."

3. In Section 7 the phrase ". . . member, and, where possible, be considered in making decisions . . ." is missing. (This may be a clerical error.)

4. Section 9 omitted the provision for a faculty advocate in the devising of a development plan for faculty whose performance does not meet expectations.

5. Section 9 omitted the phrases ". . . There shall be an agreed upon statement . . ." and ". . . to serve as a written record of this meeting."
(The AAAC draft retains a provision for all parties signing the plan.)

Dr. Giles-Gee noted two additional prerequisite features of the policy, which are not included in this draft or the cover memo. General evaluation procedures and faculty development programs on the campuses need to be strengthened.

The Chair announced the intent to continue to argue for reinstatement of the deleted provisions in Chancellor's Council and, if necessary, in Ed. Policy Committee and BOR meetings.

Strong objection was registered to the deletion of application to all faculty, in light of nearly unanimous approval of that provision by the Senate Chairs and by CUSF. The Chair noted that tenure-track faculty generally are evaluated annually, but non-tenure-track faculty generally are evaluated only by administrators, and that, at least, there ought to be a similar review for those faculty. One response was that it is inappropriate to subject "contractual," non-tenure-track faculty to periodic review since their contracts are yearly contracts, with no provision for renewal. Another reaction was that some contracts are multi-year, hence, including contractual faculty in this policy might eventually provide a requirement of justification for non-renewal of somebody who has given long and creditable service. It also was suggested that the policy was never intended to cover other than tenured faculty, and that to include them makes the document incoherent and unusable.

Strong objection was registered to reinstatement in Section 5 of the provisions for a "trigger" of a new periodic review if the faculty member is "not meeting expectations." The Chair said the AAAC had discussed and approved the "two-year trigger" provision, but may be amenable changing the "not-meeting-expectations" language.

A motion was made, seconded and passed to amend Section 5 and Section 9 by deleting the phrase "not meeting expectations," and substituting the phrase "significantly deficient in performance." As amended, the last sentence of Section 5 would read: "Two consecutive annual reviews that indicate a faculty member is SIGNIFICANTLY DEFICIENT IN PERFORMANCE shall occasion a new periodic review, regardless of rotation."

A motion was made and seconded to amend Section 1 by deleting the term

"tenured" and adding the phrase "With the exception of faculty on year-to-year contracts." As amended, Section 1 would read: "With the exception of faculty on year-to-year contracts, all faculty shall participate in a periodic review that assesses a faculty member's performance over time." The motion failed.

A motion was made and seconded to amend Section 1 by reinstating the language as approved at the February CUSF meeting. ("All fulltime faculty, tenured and nontenured, shall participate in a periodic review") The motion passed, with 12 in favor, 5 opposed.

A motion was made and seconded to amend Section 9 by reinstating the provision for a faculty advocate in designing a developmental plan (" . . . and at the faculty member's discretion, a faculty advocate"), as approved at the February CUSF meeting. The motion passed.

A suggestion was made, and the Chair agreed, to send a letter to the Senate Chairs notifying them of Council actions and urging them to discuss the issue on their campuses.

IV. REPORT OF THE ASSOCIATE VICE CHANCELLOR

A. Early Retirement: Dr. Giles-Gee reported that the Chancellor will be appointing a task force to draft early-retirement legislation for submission to the 1997 Maryland State Legislature, and that the intent is to complete the task force activity by November. She suggested CUSF begin thinking about appointees to serve on the task force. A Councilor indicated that an early retirement policy at Community College of Baltimore County included a provision for some inclusion of TIAA-CREF members, and that the action may serve as a precedent for including TIAA-CREF members in the UMS proposal.

B. UMAB "Privatization": Dr. Giles-Gee reported that the Chancellor has received the CUSF letter of inquiry and concern, and is preparing a response.

C. Productivity Indicators: Dr. Giles-Gee reported that several potential indicators suggested by CUSF (e.g. number of computers per faculty) will be included.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Educational Policy Committee: In regard to the "New Paradigms," the Committee Chair reported a recommendation that the Chancellor pursue the matter with campus administrators and faculty and that the Executive Committee continue to discuss the issue with the Chancellor. The Committee does not see the need for a Council role at this time. The Chair noted that the CUSF letter urging Senate Chairs to discuss the issue on the campuses had been sent.

A motion was made, seconded and passed to accept the Education Policy Committee Report.

B. Nominating Committee: The Committee Chair announced the nominations of James Alexander, UMCP, and Adil Shamoo, UMAB as candidates for CUSF Chair. There were no nominations from the floor.

A motion was made, seconded and passed to close nominations for the position of CUSF Chair.

Election procedures were clarified as follows:

- Chair-candidate position statements will be distributed under separate cover as early as possible before the April CUSF meeting.
- Election of the Chair will occur at the April CUSF meeting, followed by nominations for the remaining Executive Committee positions.
- Election of other officers will occur at the May meeting
- Election for all officers will be by majority vote of those members present at the meeting, with no provision for absentee ballots.
- "New" alternates (those completing terms of current members) will be eligible to vote if the Chair is notified of their appointment prior to the relevant election meeting.

C. Legislative Affairs Committee: The Committee Chair reported that the General Assembly approved the UMS budgets with few changes. There was a \$100,000 reduction in "Faculty Development for Technology" and a similar cut for a particular program at UMAB. Otherwise, the budget seems to be intact as proposed, and there is a possibility of restoring the cuts in subsequent legislative actions.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. UMS Consultation: UMAB Issues: The Chair noted previously distributed letter to the Chancellor regarding these matters, and members of the UMAB delegation expressed satisfaction. In light of the previous report that the Chancellor is preparing a response, no Council action was taken.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Contractual Faculty: A motion was made and seconded that: "The Administrative Affairs Committee investigate the use and status of contractual faculty employees on the various campuses, and report back to this body a proposed policy on the periodic review of such faculty and the appropriate uses of such evaluations."

Council discussion included the following comments:

- An investigation of conditions and practices on the campuses is necessary for CUSF to knowledgeably discuss the issue.
- This proposal seems to run counter to the previous Council action regarding Periodic Review.
- We need to be informed on a variety of issues, beyond the question of periodic review, concerning contractual faculty.
- Without "massive" staff support, this proposal constitutes an impossible task of data gathering.
- Given the limited reporting directive, there is sufficient flexibility for the committee to limit the scope of "investigation" as deemed necessary.

The motion failed, 7 in favor, 8 opposed.

Subsequent discussion suggested the need for a narrower focus of exploration, such as contractual-faculty evaluation policies and procedures. It also was suggested we need to examine the extent of replacing tenure-track faculty with contractual faculty. There was disagreement regarding the question of whether this is a campus issue or a system issue. In this light, the Chair charged Councilors to: "Think about the issues regarding contractual faculty of all sorts, consider whether any of the problems ought to be addressed on a system basis, and consider whether any of those problems merit system-wide investigation."

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair announced the availability of a "short" academic robe for donation to a member of the UMS faculty.

The meeting adjourned at 1:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

University of Maryland System
Council of University System Faculty
Minutes of the Meeting of Wednesday, April 10, 1996
University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute
Approved as Amended, May 9, 1996

Present: Cohen, Chair; Alexander, UMCP; Arthur, CSC; Block, UMCP; Booth, UMAB; Breslow, UMCP; Chapin, UMES; Fox, SSU; Glibert, CEES; Goldman, UMAB; Havas, UMAB; Jagus, UMBI; Lasher, UMBC; Lomonaco, UMBC; Luchsinger, UB; McClive, FSU; McMahon, TSU; Rebach, UMES; Shamoo, UMAB; A. Smith, SSU; R. Smith, TSU; Somers, TSU; Sternheim, UMCP ; Strain, BSU; Vietri, UMCP;

Wallinger, FSU.

Guests: Dr. Rita Colwell, President, UMBI; Dr. George Marx, UMSA;

Absent with prior notification: Langdon, BSU; Ramchander, CSC;

Absent: Ennis, UMCP; Shear, UMAB;

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

I. WELCOMING MESSAGES

A. Dr. Jagus welcomed the members and noted that it was appropriate that the first CUSF meeting to be held at COMB, the first of four UMBI sites. Dr. Jagus introduced Dr. Rita Colwell, President of UMBI, and expressed appreciation for her success in obtaining research grants and full support of UMBI faculty.

B. Dr. Colwell welcomed the Council, and reviewed highlights of the UMBI mission, activities and facilities. She characterized the Columbus Center as a "science city" which has become an international model for bringing science and technology into the public awareness. She said it is a first rate research and training facility for graduate and post graduate students, and utilizes IVAN for international course offerings. The Center also is designed to "de-mystify science" by making laboratory instrumentation and working scientists visible to the public, and by conducting classes and demonstrations for children and parents. UMBI's goal is to bring UMS to the worldwide forefront of modern molecular biotechnology and the life sciences, with programs in agricultural, marine, and medical biotechnology.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the March 12, 1996 meeting were amended to record Booth, UMAB, as present. A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the Minutes of March 12, 1996, as amended.

III. COUNCIL CHAIRS' REPORT

The Chair elaborated on several items in the previously distributed Council Chair's Report, and updated Council on actions occurring too late for inclusion in the written report. The Chair amended the written report to note that Periodic Review was not on the Chancellor's Council agenda, and that the anticipated action on the Shared Governance proposal did not occur.

The Chair reported that the Student Council approved the CUSF-amended version of the Shared Governance proposal. However, a Staff Council committee had been

working with the original Chancellor's version, and, consequently, had not considered the CUSF revisions. Based on conversations with the Chair of the Staff Council and examination of the Staff Council suggestions, the Chair said there were stylistic differences, but did not anticipate any objections to the substantive CUSF revisions. Assuming only stylistic differences and Staff Council approval of the substance of the CUSF draft, the Chair sought and received permission to negotiate a single draft of the Shared Governance policy for Chancellor's Council action.

IV. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

A. University College: The Chair reviewed the MHEC "waiver" and the Executive Committee discussions with the Chancellor. Issues raised with the Chancellor included the validity of "serving at the pleasure of the president" as a part of the contract, the administrative IPED classification, and the request for "Lecturer" positions for the UMUC faculty. The Chair also reported that, in conversations with several UMUC faculty, all had agreed with the request addressed to CUSF by Ted Kariotis.

B. Periodic Review: The Chair reviewed Executive Committee discussions with the Chancellor regarding objection to deletion of three CUSF provisions (application to all full time faculty, an optional faculty advocate, and changing the standard from "not meeting expectations" to "significantly deficient in performance"). The Chair reported no progress on extending review to all full time faculty; a willingness to "add a footnote" specifying qualitative, as well as quantitative, criteria for "not meeting expectations;" and continued reluctance to accept the provision for a faculty advocate. The Chair said he would continue to press for inclusion of all three provisions in the final draft of the policy.

Council discussion included the following comments:

- We need to continue to fight for inclusion of the three provisions, since this is a first inroad attack on tenure.
- Since the document is silent on the question of contractual faculty, campuses are free to establish their own evaluation policies and procedures for such reviews.
- It is the AAAC position that there are too many variations of contractual-faculty positions to construct a feasible single, all-inclusive, system policy for evaluation policy for those individuals.
- The proposal seems to be going forward with a now-inaccurate image that the current draft is a CUSF proposal. Consequently, CUSF should retain the option of non-endorsement.
- Those with concerns need to be raising the issue in their campus senates and in discussions with their provosts.
- The most serious problem is retention of the phrase "not meeting

expectations" as the standard.

A motion was made, seconded and passed to change the order of business to allow Council action on the question of the Periodic Review proposal.

A motion was made, seconded, and passed to Move to Committee of the Whole until 11:15 A.M. Council came out of Committee of the Whole at 11:16 A.M.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution that:
It is the sense of the Council that the Executive Committee convey to the Chancellor our regret over the impasse on these three items in the Proposed Periodic Review Policy: (a) application to all faculty, (b) provision for an optional faculty advocate in the design of a development plan, (c) "significantly deficient in performance" as the evaluative standard; and our resolve that these three items cannot be left as they are and should conform to the wording as previously passed by CUSF.

A motion was made, seconded, and passed to substitute "that Council reiterates its firm commitment to these three changes" for the phrase "our regret over the impasse on these three items."

A motion was made and seconded to amend the resolution by deleting the objection to application of the policy only to tenured faculty. It was noted that, at all stages of development of the proposal, the intent was to address only review of tenured faculty, and that, to include contractual faculty rendered the document incoherent. In response, it was suggested that this is not a "last minute change," since the Senate Presidents had approved inclusion of all faculty in January, 1995. The motion failed, 6 in favor, 12 opposed.

The motion, as amended, passed.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Nominating Committee: The Nominating Committee conducted the vote for the office of Chair. Following tabulation of the ballots, it was announced that James Alexander, UMCP had been elected Chair of CUSF for 1996-97.

VI. VICE CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

A. 1996 Legislative Session: Dr. Marx distributed copies of the "State Relations Report: 1996 Legislative Session, Maryland General Assembly," said that it was a relatively successful session for UMS, and highlighted the following points:

- The operating budget was approved after a "small reduction."
- The capital budget was approved, but with a \$1,000,000 reduction in the UMBI

equipment budget.

- Academic Revenue bonds have been capped at \$30 million in FY 98.
- The proposal for a faculty member on the Board of Regents failed.
- The Public Private Partnership Act passed, thus providing an opportunity for faculty to participate in commercial organizations in which they have proprietary intellectual-property interests.

B. Vision III Funding Plan: Dr. Marx said BOR consideration of the Vision III Funding Plan comes at an "inopportune time" from an economic perspective, because of frustrations with the reduced amounts of money available to higher education. He said the Funding Plan can still provide connections between the operating plan and the capital improvement plan, some degree of revenue predictability, and funding of the Regents' priorities in some kind of order.

C. FY 98 Budget Request: Dr. Marx said FY 98 will be a very tight capital budget year, partly because the UMS is very near its \$65 million debt capacity. Consequently, some projects will have to be restricted or delayed. At the May meeting of the Chancellor's Council, priorities will be set in a collegial process, with no presidents going outside the system to pursue other avenues of influence.

D. Name Changes: In response to a question about rumors of several institutions and/or system name changes, Dr. Marx noted the legislative requirement that the Regents address the issue and report back.

VII. COMMITTEE REPORTS (continued)

A. Nominating Committee: The Nominating Committee announced the following slate of nominations for Executive Committee positions:

Vice Chair: Larry Lasher, UMBC

Secretary: Mike Wallinger, FSU

At Large Members: Adil Shamoo, UMAB; Trudy Somers, TSU;

Pat Glibert, CEES; Steve Rebach, UMES.

There were no nominations from the floor.

A motion was made, seconded and passed to close nominations.

B. Legislative Affairs:

1. Early Retirement: The Committee Chair reported that the Early Retirement bill underwent major revisions, and that the final version was unavailable to him prior to today's meeting. Though UMS had been deleted from coverage of the bill, with assurances of support for a UMS proposal next year, features of the current bill are important since it may serve as a precedent and model for the

UMS proposal.

2. Faculty Contracts: The Committee Chair noted that he is on a task force examining faculty contracts. The Contracts task force has decided to recommend contracts specify important items, such as procedures for tenure and promotion, rather than letters of appointment that refer to policies specified in the Faculty Handbook. He reiterated the previously distributed request for input regarding items to be included in faculty contracts, as opposed to items which are included only in the faculty handbook, and thus can be changed from time to time. The Chair added that he would forward the request to Senate Chairs/Presidents.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Attendance Recording Policy: A two-part motion was made and seconded to:

1. Record absences in two categories, "Absent" and "Absent With Prior Notification."
2. Refer to Committee a proposal to change By-Law 2.5 to read: "The official minutes of each Council meeting shall include a record of those Members and Alternates present, and those Members who are absent. In the event of a Member's frequent absence from Council meetings, the faculty of that Member's institution shall decide whether or not to replace the Member on Council."

The proffered rationale was that the Chair and/or Secretary ought not be in the position of determining whether a member's absence was legitimate, that Part 1 could be implemented immediately, and that referring Part 2 to committee would allow other input and analysis of the problem.

A motion was made, seconded and passed to amend the motion by deleting Part 2. Council discussion included the suggestions that Part 2 was unnecessary, that it is desirable to encourage full representation for each campus, that the term "frequent" in Part 2 was too ambiguous, that the references to Alternates in Part 2 ought to be retained, and that the term "Prior Notification" is too ambiguous.

The motion, as amended, passed.

B. Instructor/Lecturer Contract Options: A motion was made, seconded and passed: "Resolved: CUSF recommends Instructors who were hired prior to July 1, 1996 shall be given the option of remaining under the old Appointments, Promotion and Tenure policy at their institutions or accepting the new policy."

The proffered rationale was that, at UMCP, prior to the BOR policy change making

Instructor a tenure-track rank, Instructors had a degree of job security (short of tenure) not allowable under the Lecturer title. Passage of the resolution would constitute CUSF endorsement of the general principle that individuals should have the option of retaining the job-security conditions of their original contracts.

C. Contractual Faculty Issues: Pursuant to Chair's charge during the March CUSF meeting, to gather and report information regarding the evaluation, representation, and status of full time, non-grant-funded, teaching contractual faculty on the campuses, Council engaged in a discussion of the issue to determine whether some action ought to be taken. Discussion included the following:

- At TSU both full time Adjunct and part time contractual faculty have no promise of renewal and are subject to evaluation under policies for contractals.
- CUSF ought to represent all faculty, regardless of rank or classification.
- Given the absence of a System policy, a campus may refuse to take a stand in addressing concerns such as equitable teaching loads, variation in benefit packages, or recourse in due process issues.
- The conditions are so diverse on the various campuses that one system policy is impossible. For example, at UMAB there are numerous non-tenure-track faculty, many with national reputations and six-figure salaries, who are on long-term contracts, and have Associate Professor and Professor titles.
- We ought to view with alarm and concern the rising number of non-tenure-track faculty, but also recognize the budgetary constraints forcing that situation. One possibility is to carefully investigate establishing a minimum-percentage core of tenure-track faculty at each institution.
- A major concern is that on many campuses contractual faculty are excluded from the governance system, resulting in a lack of organized attention to either immediate or long-term issues affecting them. If CUSF represents the group, discussion of the issues and long-term strategy can be brought to the fore.
- Efforts to protect the interests of contractual teaching faculty with low salaries and few or no benefits must be our primary concern, not those with six-figure salaries.

It was decided to refer the matter to Executive Committee to determine the most appropriate manner for Council to address the issues.

Councilor Block said that, as a member of the task force examining faculty contracts, he would urge the task force to write contractual stipulations for non-tenure-track, as well as tenure-track faculty.

D. UMSA Personnel Presence: A request was made to reserve a portion of time in each CUSF meeting for discussion of issues without the presence of UMSA personnel.

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair announced Dr. McMahon's appointment as Associate Provost at Towson State University, and congratulated her on behalf of the Council.

The Chair announced that Lucille Strain, BSU, and Trudy Somers, TSU, have assumed Member, rather than Alternate, positions on Council, and welcomed Lois Vietri, UMCP, as a new Member, replacing Vicki Freimuth

The Chair reminded Council that the By-Laws allow only one Alternate Member per institution.

X. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

University of Maryland System
Council of University System Faculty
Minutes of the Meeting of Wednesday, May 9, 1996
Center for Environmental and Estuarine Studies
Horn Point Environmental Laboratory, Maryland
Approved as Amended, June 14, 1996

Present: Cohen, Chair; Arthur, CSC; Blumster, UMAB; Booth, UMAB; Chapin, UMES; Ennis, UMCP; Fox, SSU; Glibert, CEES; Goldman, UMAB; Jagus, UMBI; Langdon, BSU; Lasher, UMBC; Luchsinger, UB; McMahon, TSU; Rebach, UMES; Shamoo, UMAB; A. Smith, SSU; R. Smith, TSU; Somers, TSU; Wallinger, FSU.

Guests: Dr. Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA; Dr. Tom Malone, Director, Horn Point Environmental Laboratory

Absent with prior notification: Alexander, UMCP; Block, UMCP; Breslow, UMCP; Lomonaco, UMBC; McClive, FSU; Ramchander, CSC; C. Smith, UMCP; Sternheim, UMCP; Strain, BSU; Vietri, UMCP;

Absent: Shear, UMAB;

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

I. WELCOMING MESSAGES

A. Dr. Glibert welcomed the Council to Horn Point, one of three CEES sites; noted the CEES worldwide environmental research mission; and listed several "bragging points," including approximately \$250,000 per faculty member in externally-funded research projects, and a top-five ranking in funds and projects awarded by the Oceanography Division of the National Science Foundation.

B. Dr. Tom Malone, Director of the Horn Point Environmental Laboratory, extended greetings to the Council and noted that CEES conducts undergraduate Summer Internships as well as year-round graduate education. Dr. Malone said, in an era of institutions competing for limited resources, there is a danger of losing sight of the need for institutions to cooperatively foster the educational process, including the necessary interaction of teaching and research. In that light, he said, we need to learn how to use our collective resources more effectively, and that CUSF foster that cooperative effort.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the April 10, 1996 meeting were amended to change Columbus Center to COMB. A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the Minutes of April 10, 1996, as amended.

III. COUNCIL CHAIR'S REPORT

In addition to the previously-distributed written report, the Chair reviewed discussion and action taken at the May 6, 1995 Chancellor's Council meeting, and distributed drafts of "University of Maryland System Proposed Policy on the Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty (May 6, 1996)" and of "Proposed Policy on Shared Governance in the University of Maryland System (Draft: May 2, 1996)."

A. Periodic Review/Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty: The Chair reported that, while Chancellor's Council did not accept the CUSF proposal to include non-tenure-track faculty in the policy, the Chancellor did agree to send a letter to the Presidents urging institution of a peer-review process for non-tenure-track faculty. The Chair was asked whether he presented and argued for the Council proposal. The Chair responded that he had, indeed, done so, but that Chancellor's Council rejected including non-tenure-track faculty in this document, opting instead to institute separate procedures for peer review of those faculty, probably starting soonest at UMAB.

The Chair called attention to acceptance of Council's position in the new phrase in Principles/Criteria #5 ("materially deficient in meeting expectations") and

the footnote indicating that "Qualitative performance expectations shall be determined at the department/unit level." The Chair also noted that, while Chancellor's Council rejected inclusion of provision for a faculty advocate in this document, everybody at the meeting agreed that there is nothing in the document to preclude such a provision in institutional policies.

A motion was made and seconded that Council go on record opposing the "UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM PROPOSED POLICY ON THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY (May 6, 1996)."

Arguments in favor of the motion included the following:

- As presently written, the document singles out tenured faculty and codifies post-tenure review. As such, it is a stab at the heart of tenure and we ought to oppose it on those grounds.
- From earliest meetings with the Senate Presidents, on, the intent was not to work for review of non-tenure-track faculty, but to avoid singling out tenured faculty.
- There was carefully crafted language in the original CUSF version to prevent this policy being used to quickly move toward termination of faculty. That language has been watered down to the point that those protections have disappeared.

Arguments opposed to the motion included the following:

- In light of the agreement to institute peer review of non-tenure-track faculty, this is a reasonable compromise.
- This document originated from CUSF and has been repeatedly discussed in multiple other forums with full CUSF representation. To now withdraw support at the eleventh hour would make us look extremely foolish.
- While it started in response to pressure for post-tenure review from the legislature, MHEC and UMS, CUSF effort at all stages has produced a faculty-friendly document. To reject it now would nullify that effort, allow this proposal to die, and raise the possibility of a much worse policy in its place.
- Multiple differences in faculty classifications and titles across the System need to be addressed on the individual campuses, not in this document.
- Faculty development is a crucial concern, and this proposal offers an opportunity to advance those efforts.
- We all ought to be accountable, and this document makes it more difficult to terminate those who are performing appropriately, and encourages development for those who are not.
- Changes may be preferable, but this is the best we are going to get at this time. Thus, we ought to pass this proposal and push forward proactively on other issues in a separate document.

The motion failed, 7 in favor, 12 opposed.

B. Shared Governance: The Chair noted minor editorial changes contained in the May 2, 1996 draft of the shared governance proposal, and characterized it as nearly identical to CUSF-approved drafts. The proposal is slated for consideration at the May 13, 1996 AAAC meeting, then Chancellor's Council, the BoR Educational Policy Committee, and finally, the August or September BoR meeting.

C. Early Retirement: The Chair reported formation of a UMS committee to draft an early-retirement bill for submission to the 1997 legislative session. In addition to UMSA personnel, membership will include CUSS and CUSF Chairs; Larry Lasher, UMBC; and Roy Ross, UMAB, the incoming CUSS Chair. The draft bill needs to be submitted to the governor by August 15. Reportedly, the bill will parallel SB1, rather than previously submitted UMSA proposals. One possible feature would be easing the currently burdensome process necessary to allow a retiree to continue teaching on a part-time basis.

IV. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

The Chair reported that, due to the Chancellor's travel out of the country, no further progress had been made in implementing the requested changes in the designation of UMUC faculty as Lecturers.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Nominating Committee: The Nominating Committee conducted the vote for 1996-97 Executive Committee and announced the results:

Chair: James Alexander, UMCP (elected at April CUSF meeting)

Vice Chair: Larry Lasher, UMBC

Secretary: Mike Wallinger, FSU

Member At-Large: Steve Rebach, UMES

Member At-Large: Trudy Somers, TSU

VI. VICE CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

A. Chairperson's Workshop: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed a tentative schedule for the October 25, 1996 Chairperson's Workshop, and a cover memo requesting campuses to submit tentative registrations by June 1, 1996. Cost of the workshop is \$60 per chairperson. Councilors were urged to remind chairs on their campuses.

B. Capital Planning: Dr. Giles-Gee reported that there may need to be a shift in the capital plan. Ongoing discussion with the Presidents is occurring.

C. Faculty Contracts: Dr. Giles-Gee reported that the membership of the

committee studying faculty contracts is being changed to include more faculty, and that John Anderson is now drafting tentative model contracts. The court has determined a lack of clarity in distinguishing those parts of the faculty handbooks which are contractual and those which are not, and has instructed UMS to clear it up. Reportedly, current thinking in the committee is that there ought to be a higher degree of consistency across the UMS institutions in that determination.

VII. OLD BUSINESS:

A. Domestic Partners: The Chair referred Council to the previously-distributed "Report and Recommendations of the University of Maryland System Board of Regents Ad Hoc Committee on Domestic Partner Benefits," and noted that it is scheduled for consideration at the July BOR meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to express CUSF support for the report and recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Domestic Partner Benefits. The motion passed, with 14 in favor, 2 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

A suggestion was made that, if the Board of Regents approves the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations, the Chair write a letter expressing appreciation for this and other recent stands in opposition to discrimination. No action was taken.

B. Full Time Contractual Faculty: Council engaged in a general discussion of the issue of full-time contractual faculty protections. The productivity of such discussion was questioned in light of the inability of the Councilor who initiated the issue to be present at this meeting. The intent was announced to eventually appoint a committee to draft a specific proposal for CUSF consideration.

Several agreed with one Councilor who urged the restoration of previous language, whereby non-tenure-track faculty with seven or more years of continuous full-time service shall not be non-renewed for other than programmatic reasons without receiving all the due process protections normally reserved for tenured faculty.

VIII. The meeting adjourned at 12:09.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

Council of University System Faculty
Minutes of the Meeting of Wednesday, June 14, 1996
University of Maryland Eastern Shore
Approved as Submitted, September 11, 1996

Present: Cohen, Chair; Alexander, UMCP; Arthur, CSC; Block, UMCP; Chapin, UMES; Ennis, UMCP; Fox, SSU; Glibert, CEES; Lasher, UMBC; Lomonaco, UMBC; Rebach, UMES; A. Smith, SSU; R. Smith, TSU; Somers, TSU; Sternheim, UMCP; Wallinger, FSU.

Guests: Dr. Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA; Dr. William Hytche, President, UMES; Dr. Gian Gupta, UMES.

Absent with prior notification: McClive, FSU; McMahon, TSU; Ramchander, CSC;

Absent: Booth, UMAB; Breslow, UMCP; Goldman, UMAB; Jagus, UMBI; Langdon, BSU; Luchsinger, UB; Shamoo, UMAB; Shear, UMAB; Strain, BSU; Vietri, UMCP;

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

I. WELCOMING MESSAGES:

A. Dr. Gian Gupta, Chair of the UMES Faculty Senate welcomed Council to UMES; praised CUSF for its work, especially Dr. Rebach's and Dr. Chapin's work in representing UMES; and urged CUSF consideration of three issues of continuing concern: maintenance of quality of education within a distance-learning environment, faculty-student ratios, and collective bargaining.

B. Dr. William Hytche, President, UMES, was introduced by the Chair, who noted that Dr. Hytche will soon retire after thirty six years at UMES. Dr. Hytche welcomed Council, invited councilors to tour campus and the accommodations, and assured Council that past and present CUSF Chairs have represented CUSF with skill and finesse in various boards and councils.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the May 9, 1996 meeting were amended to delete Havas, UMAB from the list of absentees. A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the Minutes of May 9, 1996, as amended.

III. COUNCIL CHAIR'S REPORT

A. MHEC Faculty Advisory Council: Chair Elect Alexander represented CUSF at the May 21 meeting, and reported that FAC is studying principles of distance education across the state and secondary-college articulation. He suggested

CUSF needs to stay actively involved in the examination of both issues.

B. Chancellor's Council: The Chair and Chair Elect reported that the primary meeting concerns were various financial matters, including the capital budget and a presentation of a report on faculty salaries ("Analysis of Faculty Salaries, FY91-96: UMS Institutions and Their Respective Carnegie Groups, May, 1996"). The proposed Principles of Shared Governance was presented as an information item, and is scheduled for consideration at the September BoR Educational Policy Committee meeting.

C. BoR Educational Policy Committee: Vice Chair Lasher represented CUSF at the May 21 meeting, and presented the CUSF concerns regarding the proposed Periodic Review policy, as now written. The Committee discussed, but took no action on the issue, due to lack of a quorum. Vice Chair Lasher noted the need for CUSF representation at the July meeting in the eventuality that the Committee takes action on the proposal immediately prior to the Board meeting.

D. Faculty Workload: The Chair distributed copies of a May 13 memorandum from Vice Chancellor Marx regarding the 1995-96 Faculty Workload. The Department of Fiscal Services reportedly intends to recommend changes in the data collection form, including new lines to report contact hours and to report the number of faculty who engaged in no "credit-bearing teaching activity."

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Faculty Development Committee: Committee Chair Sternheim distributed and summarized a written report on 1996 Faculty Development Fund grant applications and awards. Of the nine applications, four were rejected, two were returned for revision, and three were approved. Approved applications were: UMAB/TSU: "Training Faculty in Modern Sectional Anatomy," \$2000; UMCP/UMBC: "Cinema and the Study of Classical Antiquity," \$3000; and UMAB/TSU: "Learning to Teach Diversity Across Health Care Curricula," \$2000.

With the help of Dr. Gile-Gee, the Committee developed and administered a program-evaluation survey of past award recipients. The results suggest benefits of the grants include increased inter-institutional collaboration regarding teaching research and curriculum development, and, in some cases, better success in competition for additional outside funding.

B. Regents Faculty Awards: Jay Alexander reviewed the tentative decisions of the group recommending selection procedures for Regents Awards to faculty in "Group B" institutions. The intent is to keep paper work to a minimum by using existing documentation and have a CUSF committee forward campus nominations for the Regents' selection. The committee's preference is to make these exemplary "event" awards, rather than "star" awards or "lifetime activity" awards.

Trudy Somers, reporting for the "Group A" committee, noted difficulty obtaining responses from faculty, said the committee surveyed provosts, and suggested the committee was arriving at approximately the same conclusions as the "Group B" committee regarding procedures and criteria.

Dr. Giles-Gee noted the need for coordinated timing of procedures of the two groups and for clarity of criteria sent to the campuses so that all nominations for a given award addressed the same criteria.

C. Faculty Contracts: Councilor Block, the CUSF representative to the committee studying the issue of a standard UMS faculty contract, distributed and summarized the essential provisions of the proposed contract for new hires, and sought Council advice to guide participation in further meetings on the issue. The proposed contract comes in response to a court order to specify those items in UMS faculty handbooks which are regarded as part of a faculty member's contract.

In that light, Item 4 specifies that "paragraphs I.C.1 through I.C.16 of the University of Maryland System Policy on Appointment, Rank, & Tenure" are incorporated as provisions of the contract, and specifies, for tenure-track appointments, a date for tenure review, "unless this date is changed by mutual agreement or pursuant to institutional policy."

Item 5 specifies that the appointee is subject to all policies and procedures adopted or amended by UMS (e.g. annual leave, sabbatical leave, patents and copyrights, teaching-evaluation criteria) but that they are not incorporated in the agreement and are subject to change.

Council discussion included, among others, the following points:

- The policy will not affect current tenured or tenure-track faculty.
- The list of non-contractual policies in Item 5 is a mix of both appropriate (e.g. annual leave and sick leave benefits) and inappropriate elements of a faculty contract (e.g. scholarly and professional misconduct). Consequently, the list of policies ought to be split and treated differently.
- This is another example of UMSA or the Court asking CUSF to concur in signing away benefits, and we ought not do so.
- The policies in Item 5 ought to be considered in three separate categories:
 - Membership-based benefits (e.g. sick leave)
 - Membership-based awards (e.g. sabbatical leave)
 - Professional standards (e.g. scholarly/professional misconduct)
- In response to a request for information, it was noted that, in past policy changes, the Board has allowed a choice of whether to remain under the old policy provisions.
- In response to questions regarding provisions for changing the date for tenure review, it was noted that the proposal does not modify existing policy

whereby the Board permits both earlier and later tenure review. It was suggested that the Board is not interested in exercising greater control over institutional policies in this regard.

Councilor Block was charged to compile and distribute for comment a list of those elements in Item 5 which CUSF members wish to be included as part of the contract, and not subject to later policy changes as conditions of employment.

V. VICE CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

A. Statewide Plan for Postsecondary Education: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed copies of an MHEC document, "Issues and Trends in Maryland Postsecondary Education," and highlighted several features of the report. The report is identified as the first step in the process of updating the statewide plan for postsecondary education, and, in addition to an overview, summarizes current issues and seeks response to questions regarding five areas of concern: Educational Quality, Effectiveness, Access, Diversity, and Efficiency. Time to Degree, Distance Learning, Faculty Quality, and Student Preparation were singled out as subtopics particularly worthy of attention. Faculty are invited to review and comment on the report by accessing it on the MHEC Web site (<http://ube.ubalt.edu/www/mhec/theplan.html>) or by calling MHEC (410-974-2971). August 1, 1996 is the deadline for responses.

B. Remedial Education: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed and briefly discussed an MHEC report which provides some data on the current status of remedial education in Maryland public higher education, and poses several policy questions. In response to a question of the feasibility of accommodating a 20% enrollment increase while also reducing remedial coursework, it was noted that approximately 90% of the remedial burden is in the community colleges.

C. Benchmarks: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed and briefly discussed the June 13, 1996 draft of UMSA "Benchmarking Accountability Indicators." It was noted that MHEC requires benchmarks for the accountability indicators, and that, for the first time, a benchmark is defined for a given indicator as "the level of the indicator the institution sets itself to achieve within a five year time frame."

The timetable for approval requires BoR consideration in August and submission to MHEC in October.

D. Undergraduate Admissions: A UMSA Committee Working Draft of a "Policy on Undergraduate Admissions," dated May 31, 1996, was distributed and summarized. It was noted that the policy sets minimum criteria, that institutions are required to develop and publish individual criteria which may be more rigorous, and that institutions need to reevaluate their admissions policies in light of the move toward performance-based graduation requirements in Maryland secondary schools. It was suggested that the proposed policy be placed on the September

CUSF agenda.

E. General Education: Dr. Giles-Gee distributed and briefly discussed a March 14, 1996 draft of "Points of Consensus" regarding "General Education Implementation Guiding Principles." The intent of the document is to clarify some of the language in the General Education Regulations being implemented in Fall, 1997.

VI. OTHER CONCERNS

A. Retirement Incentives Legislation: It was reported that Jay Alexander and Joan Langdon are serving as CUSF representatives on the committee drafting legislation governing provisions for early retirement of higher education personnel. The proposal is likely to be similar to SB1 which passed in 1996 and governs all other state employees. Reportedly, some legislators are pleased at the prospect that retirees are tenured, while replacements would not, and might not even be in tenure-track positions.

B. 1996-97 Council:

1. Council Meeting dates for Fall, 1996 are as follows:

Wednesday, September 11 -- UMCP

Friday, October 11 -- FSU

Monday, November 11 -- TSU

Tuesday, December 10 -- UMBC

2. Chair Elect Alexander announced that he has been offered a position at another institution, but that regardless of his decision whether to accept it, he is committed to serving out the year as CUSF Chair.

3. Names, mail and e-mail addresses, and phone/fax numbers of new members need to be forwarded to both the Chair Elect and the Secretary.

4. Productivity Measures: Chair Elect Alexander announced that he has been asked to suggest ways to encourage broader faculty involvement in defining the Vision III productivity measures.

5. Discussion and Efficiency in Council Meetings: Several concerns were raised regarding the way in which Council conducts business. One suggestion was to allow the Chair to set aside a period of time for discussion of an original motion prior to recognizing any amendments, thereby avoiding the current practice which frequently deletes discussion of the merits of the original motion. Another suggestion was more frequently to refer proposals to committees prior to consideration by Council, thereby reducing the tendency to write motions on the floor, while in the process of discussion of an issue. No

action was taken on either suggestion.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. It was announced that this was the final meeting in which Kathy Fox, Ira Block and Cathy Ennis would serve as CUSF Councilors. Special appreciation was expressed for the years of service Kathy Fox has provided in various capacities, dating back to the formation of CUSF.

B. Council expressed appreciation for Joel Cohen's service as Chair and his exemplary representation of CUSF concerns.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

University of Maryland System
Council of University System Faculty
Minutes of the Meeting of Monday, November 11, 1996
Towson State University
Approved, as Amended, December 10, 1996

Present: Alexander (Chair); Arthur, CSC; Block (alt.), UMCP; Breslow, UMCP; Boberg, UMCP; Booth, UMAB; Cohen, UMCP; Davis, UMCP; Gill, UMBC; Glibert, CEES; Goldman, UMAB; Havas, UMAB; Jagus, UMBI; Lasher, UMBC; Lomonaco, UMBC; Luchsinger, UB; McClive, FSU; Rebach, UMES; Ross, TSU (alt.); Rossi, SSU; Siegel, TSU; Shamo, UMAB; A. Smith, SSU; R. Smith, TSU; Somers, TSU; Sternheim, UMCP; Wallinger, FSU.

Absent With Prior Notice: Strain, BSU; Vietri, UMCP.

Absent: Chapin, UMES; Ramchander, CSC;

Guests: Dr. Joann Argersinger, UMBC; Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA; Dr. Michael O'Pecko, TSU; Dr. DeLois Powell, UMES; Dr. Hoke Smith, President, TSU.

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

I. WELCOMING MESSAGES

A. TSU Faculty Senate Chair, Dr. Michael O'Pecko, extended a welcome to the Towson campus and noted changes occupying the TSU Senate, including: modification of the promotion and tenure policies necessary to accommodate the modified UMS policy; expansion of academic programs to accommodate the anticipated significant enrollment increase; and orienting several new administrators to TSU's cultural commitment to shared governance.

B. Dr. Hoke Smith, TSU President, reaffirmed the welcome to the campus and shared his thoughts on shared governance. He said it is necessary for faculty to understand the philosophical and practical basis of the faculty role in shared governance: the specialized knowledge and perspective they bring to hiring, promoting and retaining faculty, and deciding on curriculum. Noting that tenure is under attack, he said that if it is to survive we must get away from the rigidity, adding that if "two or three incompetent faculty" were fired, it would help get beyond the rigidity of the tenure system.

The second factor in the survival of shared governance noted by President Smith was the need to recognize and adapt to the rapid changes in higher education occasioned by the market approach and by technology. He suggested that unless we adapt, as a "regulated industry," higher education in Maryland may be at a disadvantage in competing with corporate programs and programs offered worldwide via distance education technology.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. Membership Bylaws Amendment: A motion was made, seconded and passed to change the order of business in order to consider at this time the Administrative Affairs Committee motion to amend Section II. 2. 6 of the CUSF Bylaws to read:

"Each UMS institution may designate one alternate delegate for each delegate from that institution. Any delegate who must miss a CUSF meeting is responsible for briefing the alternate prior to his/her attending that CUSF meeting. (A UMS institution shall be represented at a CUSF meeting by no more than its full complement of delegates.)"

Council moved to Committee of the Whole for discussion of the motion. The discussion tended to focus on two positions: The argument in favor of the motion was that it improved the level and quality of representation of the institutions. The opposing argument was that the motion was detrimental to the necessary level of continuity and commitment to the spectrum of Council work. In addition, discussion addressed the question of an appropriate number of alternates, beyond one per institution.

Upon coming out of Committee of the Whole, a motion was made, seconded and passed to refer back to committee, with instructions to prepare alternate forms of the motion which address the number of alternates and whether the alternates are designated alternates for individual councilors.

III. K-16 PARTNERSHIP: DISCUSSION WITH DR. ARGERSINGER, UMBC

A. Overview: The Chair introduced Dr. Joanne Argersinger, UMBC Provost and Chair of the Maryland K-16 Partnership Workgroup, and referred Council to the previously distributed September 3, 1996 Draft of the Workgroup Report by three Design Teams: K-16 Standards, Competencies, and Assessments; Professional Development; and Community Engagement.

Dr. Argersinger reviewed the history of the cooperative effort to achieve greater coordination between and among all levels of public education in Maryland. What began as a request for UMS input regarding the learning goals for high school graduation has evolved into plans for development of a cooperative, iterative process for reform of K-16 education, and the emergence of a K-16 Council, with members drawn from MSDE, MHEC, UMSA and the business community. After examining efforts in other states, it was decided that a critical feature was the necessity of faculty from all levels cooperatively interacting to accomplish coordination of high school graduation requirements and college admission standards. Current efforts are devoted to discovering ways to maintain and continue intersegmental conversations, figuring out how to focus on outputs instead of inputs in setting standards, and assuring that 2- and 4-year institutions' standards are appropriate for the improved high school graduation standards.

B. Questions and Responses: Discussion items included the following, among others:

1. In response to a question about the status of the September 3 Draft Report, Dr. Argersinger said the K-16 Council had approved a slightly modified version at its September meeting.

2. In response to inquiries regarding the long-term implementation intent and likelihood of becoming state policy affecting the local school boards, Dr. Argersinger said the Design Team Co-Chairs decided to give it two years to see whether change was being accomplished, and that from that point, legislative action on a K-16 structure and standards would depend on assessment of results and on gubernatorial and legislative decisions. She noted that MSDE is holding hearings and a number of "roundtables" are planned to address the issues. Dr. Giles-Gee added that individual school system boards will retain authority and, while it cannot determine policy directly, the K-16 Council can influence it through intersegmental participation in the process.

3. Concerns were expressed about the "reality" of social promotion, assumptions that a traditional college education is appropriate for everybody, the impact on lowering of standards in 4-year institutions, and the expectations of business that universities provide what amounts to vocational education. Dr. Argersinger responded that it is one goal of the K-16 Partnership to provide a forum for discussion of those issues, and that those concerns are being raised. As an example, she cited an expressed view that it was a mistake to move to a model whereby the 2-year institutions provide the general education and the 4-year institutions concentrate on upper-division education.

4. The suggestion was made that what is needed is the flexibility to assess and adjust to changing conditions, and concern was expressed that, if goals are too high, the result would be to encourage dropouts. Dr. Argersinger agreed, noting the same concerns exist in the K-16 Council and Workgroups.

5. The suggestion was made that the highest obligation in education design is to serve the best interests of students, and that a private-sector, market-driven rationale may not do so because of a constantly changing market, and because of a disparity between what the private sector wants and what the students believe is wanted. Dr. Argersinger replied that the private sector does not speak with one voice, but that, in her estimate, it is not generally seeking vocational education. Instead, what the private sector seems to want are critical thinking, analytic, communication, and teamwork skills. She suggested these wishes are highly compatible with the goals of nearly all institutional general education programs. She added that whether we are accomplishing those goals and whether we have the resources to accomplish them are the issues.

6. Serious reservation was registered to the goal of establishing a single instrument to assess desired high school learning, determine readiness for work place entry, determine readiness for college, and assess the general education experience of a student. Dr. Argersinger characterized the goal in question as a "stretch goal," noted that a number of issues needed to be put on the table, and said that better indicators are needed to assess college-course readiness (e.g. in mathematics) in order to better use available resources.

7. The question was asked, assuming that secondary education retains control of the assessment standards and that higher education institutions tie admissions to that assessment mechanism, what guarantee is there that higher education institutions will have sufficient control needed to maintain standards? Dr. Argersinger replied that it is important to build in controls up front, and if that is not done, then it will not be an acceptable system. She added that this is why full cooperation of all segments is needed at this stage.

8. Concern was expressed that if students do not perform well on the assessment instruments, the pressure will be on the colleges to lower their standards, rather than on the schools to do a better job of preparing students. In response, Dr. Argersinger questioned whether current institutional standards are high enough, and said the K-16 Initiative can counteract the political pressure by getting out in front of the issues, instead of only reacting to the pressure. At a later point, doubt was expressed about the ability of colleges to resist the political pressure to lower standards, given the fact that higher education is at the "back end" of the partnership, and cannot back up the entire system by refusing admission.

9. One Councilor challenged the assumption that improved student performance can be accomplished by coordination and higher standards. Dr. Argersinger suggested students need to be challenged early on, and that there is a need to bump up standards at every level, thereby encouraging those at the next lower level to figure out ways of getting students to that new performance standard.

10. It was noted that employers are seeking more rapid maturity and development of critical thinking skills. In that light, the question was how do we develop critical thinking at an earlier level, and how do we assess those skills? Dr. Argersinger acknowledged the difficulty of doing so, suggested more is being done in that regard at the elementary and secondary level than at the college level, and that internships are considered by some to be one approach to meeting employer demands.

11. It was suggested that the initiative does nothing to address the major access and performance barriers embedded in social, cultural and economic conditions. Dr. Argersinger acknowledged the significance of that barrier, and suggested part of the solution lies in better preparation and professional development of elementary teachers in urban and rural schools, and in challenging students.

12. The process of generating the general-education articulation policies was used as an example of the necessity of intersegmental faculty participation in the determination of appropriate standards and assessment procedures and instruments.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the minutes of the October 11, 1996 Council meeting, as submitted.

V. CHAIR'S REPORT

The Chair referred Council to the previously distributed written report; noted that guests for the December 10 meeting at UMBC will be Frank Komenda and Joe Vivona, who will discuss the budget and the upcoming legislative session, and Kevin Lawrence, the Student Regent; and noted that Chancellor Langenberg would attend the January 24 meeting at UB. The Chair also reported two items of interest from the November 7 Chancellor's Council: a "Time to Degree Report and Recommendations" which avoids drastic measures in favor of recommendations such as advising to address the issue, and a proposed UMS policy to protect "whistle blowers" in the event of reporting illegalities.

In response to a question about a "Benchmarks" item on the Chancellor's Council agenda, the Chair deferred to Dr. Giles-Gee for clarification. She referred to the previously distributed MHEC Accountability Indicators and Benchmarks report, and noted that it comes in response to legislative demand and incorporates a retooling and consolidation of reports required of all institutions. Dr. Giles-Gee said the Vision III Indicators are part of the establishment of bases for assessing the three 20%-productivity-increase goals which are part of Vision III, and that they also will be part of the final accountability report.

Upon request of the Chair, Dr. Giles-Gee reported on the Department Chairs Workshop. She said that the evaluations had been processed and that she would give a complete report at the December meeting, but that preliminary indications showed positive responses to MHEC Secretary Florestano's presentation. Dr. Giles-Gee also noted that CUSF input and recommendations will be needed in the Spring for planning next year's workshop.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Nominations Committee: The Committee Chair distributed a report on CUSF reapportionment, which includes the representation formula and a summary of the 1995 UMS data used to determine that no changes in number of representatives are called for at this time. In response to a question regarding the source of the data used in the UMS report, Dr. Giles-Gee said it comes from the data reported by the campus institutional research offices, and conforms to the "IPED" numbers used for federal and state reporting. It also was suggested that the procedure for reconciling discrepancies was for the campus institutional research office to talk to Javier Miyares at UMSA.

The Committee Chair also noted that, in light of a computer-system failure, Councilors need to re-submit nominations for members of the Telecommunications Council.

V. VICE CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Dr. Giles Gee reported that the Regents' Faculty Awards program is on the table

and scheduled for implementation; distributed copies of the UMS response to the MHEC Trends and Issues document; and noted that the Faculty Handbook Committee's draft of the proposed new faculty contract/letter of appointment, after discussion by AAAC, was in the hands of presidents and was scheduled for final discussion.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Membership Criteria: A motion was made and seconded to: Instruct the Nominations Committee to develop uniform criteria to determine representation of all UMS institutions on the Council of University System Faculty. Discussion of the motion centered on discrepancies in the number of UMUC faculty reported to various bodies, treatment of faculty at UMUC, and the absence of a UMUC faculty body to conduct an election of a CUSF Councilor. It also was noted that the Chair has been charged to discuss the matter with UMUC President Ben Massey.

A motion to table failed on a tie vote.

The main motion failed, with 8 in favor and 9 opposed.

B. Distribution of Minutes: A motion was made and seconded to distribute unapproved minutes to the membership for redistribution to the faculty at their institutions. Discussion focused on the issues of convenience, lead time in preparing reports to the faculty, the accuracy of unapproved minutes, and the precedent of current policy prohibiting posting of unapproved minutes on the UMS Web site. The motion failed.

VII. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 1:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

University of Maryland System
Council of University System Faculty
Minutes of the Meeting of Monday, December 10, 1996
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
Approved, January 24, 1997

Present: Alexander (Chair); Arthur, CSC; Block (alt.), UMCP; Booth, UMAB; Breslow, UMCP; Chapin, UMES; Cohen, UMCP; Elam, BSU; Gill, UMBC; Goldman, UMAB; Havas, UMAB; Jagus, UMBI; Lasher, UMBC; Lomonaco, UMBC; Luchsinger, UB; McClive, FSU; Rebach, UMES; Ross, TSU (alt); Rossi, SSU; Siegel, TSU; Shamo, UMAB;

Somers, TSU; Sternheim, UMCP; Strain, BSU; Wallinger, FSU; Wright, CEES (alt.).

Absent With Prior Notice: Boberg, UMCP; Davis, UMCP; Glibert, CEES.

Absent: Ramchander, CSC; A. Smith, SSU; R. Smith, TSU; Vietri, UMCP.

Guests: Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA; Frank Komenda, UMSA; Paul Sweet, UMSA; Joe Vivona, UMSA.

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

I. WELCOMING MESSAGES

Dr. Ed Orser, Chair of the UMBC Senate, extended a welcome to the campus, noted that UMBC currently is celebrating its thirtieth anniversary, briefly discussed the strong tradition of shared governance and independent faculty at UMBC, and expressed appreciation for the work done by CUSF.

UMBC President Freeman Hrabowski reiterated Dr. Orser's welcome to campus. Dr. Hrabowski noted that, contrary to the we - they attitudes expressed at a recent conference he had attended, a sense of shared values prevails at UMBC, and is at the core of what we do in higher education. President Hrabowski also said CUSF is steadily gaining credibility in the eyes of the Regents, and noted that even the Regents' language is changing as they become more aware of the role and benefit of faculty in the shared governance process.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Several amendments were made to the draft of the minutes of the November 11, 1996 CUSF meeting: Douglas Ross (TSU) was added to the list of those present; Dr. Delois Powell (UMES) was listed as a guest, rather than the mistaken identification as the UMES alternate member; several typographical errors were noted. A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the minutes of the November 11, 1996 Council meeting, as amended.

III. CHAIR'S REPORT

The Chair referred Council to the written Chair's Report, and also briefly discussed:

-- Upcoming presentations at BOR Committee meetings of particular import for UMAB.

-- His attendance at the Governor's Higher Education Summit, where one presenter said higher education must be responsive to the needs of business, and that

"this means tenure."

-- His attendance at the Shady Grove Center II ribbon-cutting ceremony, where the Governor gave a partial preview of his FY 98 higher-education budget priorities, including \$22 million to "jump start" the universities (including \$5 million for UMCP and \$10 million spread over 10 years for UMAB capital construction) and an unspecified amount for tuition scholarships.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Executive Committee: The Chair referred Council to the written committee report and also briefly discussed the Senate/Forum Chairs meeting held on December 7, 1996, where a central point of discussion with the Chancellor was the role of junior faculty and their perceptions of barriers to tenure.

Councilor Lasher (UMBC) is on the planning committee for a Systemwide Symposium on Distance Education to set the direction of distance education for the next millennium. Each campus will send five representatives (Provost, a Dean or Department Chair, one faculty member, and two at-large). Councilors were urged to stay alert for the announcement and to submit ideas for the symposium agenda.

It was noted that the Distance Education Symposium dates conflict with the March CUSF meeting, and that the May CUSF meeting is scheduled for the last day of classes for the Spring Semester. The possibility of changing CUSF meeting dates will be investigated.

B. Nominations and Membership Committee: The Committee Chair referred Council to the written report on representation reapportionment, and noted that UMAB is engaged in discussions with UMSA regarding the accuracy of the number of faculty reported to/by UMSA.

The Committee Chair identified Dr. Kenneth Witmer (FSU) and Dr. Richard Swain (UB) as the only nominations submitted for three faculty positions on the Telecommunications Council. CUSF Chair Alexander indicated a willingness to continue representing CUSF through the end of this academic year, if needed, but also suggested the need for "new blood" on the council.

C. Faculty Development Committee:

1. Faculty Development Awards: The Committee Chair referred Council to the previously distributed data on the Faculty Development Fund Awards and Request for Proposal forms. A total of \$10 thousand is available for collaborative teaching-development projects, with a maximum of \$5,000 per project. The announcement and RFP are also being distributed to the campuses and will be available on the Web.

The Faculty Development Committee has been charged with developing responses to two BOR Education Policy Committee requests: to develop criteria and processes for collaborative faculty efforts which parallel the recently approved Regents' Faculty Awards, and to consider how recognition for inter-institutional efforts among faculty could be incorporated into the reward structure. It was suggested that the Executive Committee seek clarification of a discrepancy between what the Regents seem to be seeking and what the Chancellor has exemplified in recent discussions of collaborative projects and faculty development projects. One interpretation is that faculty development is a larger issue, and deserves CUSF attention as such.

2. Salary Alternatives: The Committee Chair referred Council to a written report responding to a request from Vice Chancellor Marx, and read a Committee motion to be introduced for action under New Business: "We move that the Executive Committee of CUSF strongly oppose the proposal that improvements in the quality of academic life (e.g. library materials, equipment, etc.) be considered as an alternative to increases in faculty salaries."

V. VICE CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

A. Accident Leave Policy: Associate Vice Chancellor Helen Giles-Gee referred Council to the previously distributed new "Policy on Accident Leave and Creditable and Non-Creditable Sick Leave for Faculty Members." The new policy was necessary to bring UMS policy into line with new federal law. Of note is the reduction of compensation to two-thirds of pay, necessitated because the benefits are non-taxable.

B. Chairpersons Workshop: Dr. Giles-Gee referred Council to the previously distributed evaluation of the workshop, and noted that she would come back to Council in the Spring for recommendations of department chairs to serve on a planning committee for next year's workshop.

C. Faculty Contract: Information and reactions from institutions and from the Executive Committee will be shared with AAAC. Next, it will be referred to Presidents Council and then to Chancellor's Council. Members will have an opportunity to react to their presidents.

D. Regents Faculty Awards: The Awards will be implemented in Spring, 1997. The BOR will appoint a Regent to sit on the selection committee, and CUSF will need to select faculty to do likewise.

E. Inter-Institutional Graduate Council: Dr. Giles-Gee introduced Paul Sweet, Associate Vice Chancellor for Federal Relations, who briefed CUSF on the "Policy on Inter-Institutional Graduate Faculty" and opportunities for UMS faculty to participate in the Graduate Council. The intent of the policy is to

expand student access to graduate faculty throughout UMS. Given doubts that the information has been passed on from the presidents to the faculty, Dr. Sweet asked CUSF members to spread the word and invited them to participate. Included in Council discussion was the suggestion that the information be brought to the attention of the campus faculty senates.

VI. LEGISLATIVE AGENDA: DISCUSSION WITH FRANK KOMENDA

The Chair introduced Frank Komenda, Associate Vice Chancellor for Legislative Affairs, and noted Mr. Komenda's past willingness to work with CUSF Chairs and with the CUSF Legislative Affairs Committee. Mr. Komenda said he would discuss the "political" side of the legislative session, while Vice Chancellor Vivona would discuss the UMS budget request.

A. Legislative Agenda Overview: Mr. Komenda said the Governor will again propose a 3% increase for higher education, which is significant in light of flat or reduced budgets for all other state agencies, except for K-12 Education and Public Safety. He said that is a clear indication of the Governor's commitment to education and recognition that it is pay back time for the extraordinary hits taken by public higher education, especially UMS, during the recessionary times of the late '80's and early '90's. He said that conversations with legislators suggest they agree with the Governor, and that severe cuts in the UMS budget request are not anticipated. He said the legislators recognize that the Chancellor, Regents, faculty and staff have all chipped in to achieve economies. He also said House Speaker Taylor recently said 1997 is the year for higher education. Reportedly, there has been some discussion of formula funding for higher education, and it has not yet been decided whether that is a wise approach. Mr. Komenda also distributed copies of material in support of the Governor's theme that education is the engine that runs the state economy and emphasizes the tax and business development benefits provided by higher education.

B. Early Retirement: Mr. Komenda distributed copies of the UMS "Issue Briefings" for the 1997 session of the General Assembly, covering several legislative proposals, including, among others, the Management Flexibility proposal. A bill will be introduced to provide for a customized early-retirement option similar to that provided other state employees last year. For faculty, eligibility starts at age 60 for those with 25 years of service and provides one month's credit for every year of participation in a state retirement system. Early faculty-retirement incentives are projected to produce a one-time cost of \$7 million in FY 99, offset by anticipated savings to institutions in following years. In response to a later question about equitable treatment for those in TIAA-CREF, Mr. Komenda said there is no chance that employees in TIAA-CREF retirement programs will receive any additional benefits, including spousal benefits for retirees.

C. UMCP Flagship Enhancement Report: Mr. Komenda distributed copies of a 1996 Joint Chairmen's Report, prepared by the Department of Fiscal Services, on the progress of attaining the goals set by the 1988 Maryland Charter for Higher Education. Mr. Komenda said that reports on the other mandated enhancements are likely to come in the future.

D. Faculty Workload: Mr. Komenda said a frequently asked question is whether the legislature is serious about the issue of faculty workload, and that the answer is: "Most definitely, yes!" He said that legislatively-required annual reports have convinced legislators of the myth that faculty are not working hard. He also said that the continuing concern is accountability and supervision, and that, rather than wanting to establish artificial standards and controls over how much time faculty spend in the classroom, the legislators want to make sure somebody knows and supervises.

E. Responses to Council Questions:

In response to a question of legislative views on the matter of some institutions (e.g. Towson) assuming the burden of absorbing the anticipated 20% student increase without additional funds, Mr. Komenda said that was a matter of internal BOR policy, not a matter that will come to the Legislature.

Concern was expressed that delaying attention to the other mandated enhancements (e.g. to HBI's) will mean an increasing gap between the "haves" and the "have nots," and that the legislators need to be made aware of the pressing need for the other enhancements. Mr. Komenda said the legislators are, indeed aware of the need, and have chosen to address the enhancements one-at-a-time, as funds become available, and as the Governor directs the resources in his budget proposals. He added that this is another matter of internal BOR policy. A Councilor suggested the need for an announced long term plan for addressing enhancements to replace the current approach of undetermined dates for addressing the other enhancements.

Mr. Komenda distributed copies of the schedule of House and Senate hearings on the budgets of each of the UMS institutions, and urged faculty to attend. He suggested such attendance would reveal how legislators view the particular institutions, and may provide answers to particular questions being proposed here.

A Councilor suggested that, in past years, supplemental-budget requests for some UMS institutions have disproportionately outnumbered those for others, and asked how one could marshal the necessary power to advance such requests. Mr. Komenda said he could not recall such a situation. It was suggested, and Mr. Komenda agreed, that the budgetary process is highly politicized, and consequently, the necessary political approach was to involve the institution's

local legislative delegations in institutional advocacy.

In response to a question regarding legislative attention to the time-to-degree issue, Mr. Komenda said one idea advanced was to provide tuition incentives to students who graduate in less than four years, and penalize students who take longer. He characterized that proposal as "not thought out."

In response to concern that the discussion of enhancements seemed to stop at the first four listed in the 1988 legislation, Mr. Komenda responded that there was no intent to stop at the first four. He also said there was disagreement regarding whether or not the order of listing also indicated priorities. At a later point, Vice Chancellor Vivona noted the fallacy in the entire discussion of the enhancements is the faulty assumption that the institutions were ever adequately financed to begin with.

VII. UMS OPERATING BUDGET REQUEST: DISCUSSION WITH JOE VIVONA, VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

A. Overview: Dr. Vivona said his budget presentations to legislators and other groups would be framed in the light of recent achievements in the areas of academic excellence, research grants, minority access, and the value of the University of Maryland family to the Maryland community in terms of economic development and the environment. He also said the goal of showing data on UMS management efficiency is to show legislators that we are making progress via various initiatives. Finally, he suggested it will be necessary to show legislators that, in comparison to state funding for health care and public safety, higher education has been losing ground steadily for several years.

B. Operating Budget Highlights: Vice Chancellor Vivona provided a detailed presentation of the FY 98 UMS Operating Budget Request, including the following highlights:

- The total state general funds request for \$17.3 million is 3% over the FY 97 budget, and represents only 31% of the total UMS operating budget.
- \$11 million is designated for addressing Regents' priorities, including \$4.9 million for Undergraduate Education and \$2.3 million for Competitive Faculty Salaries.
- Approximately half of the \$23 million needed to meet higher operating costs and unfunded mandates will be funded from tuition, with the balance coming from improved productivity and internal reallocation.
- FY 98 resident tuition increases will range from 3% at UMES to 10% at UMBC.

C. Other Budget Related Issues: Dr. Vivona also noted several other issues, including, among others, the following:

- Enrollment Growth: He said MHEC does not believe enrollment growth should

be recognized in funding proposals, and that, consequently, UMS will need to do a good job of "educating" various constituencies.

-- Faculty Salary Enhancements: He suggested that the original proposal to request \$5 million for faculty retention and recruitment at UMCP may be revised in the Governor's office to provide funds for all institutions, over a 2-year period, to approach the 85th-percentile goal.

-- Long Term Planning: He suggested that future budget-building processes need to provide for greater linkage between the capital and operating budgets, incorporate a budget model in the planning process, and link debt affordability to the capital and operating budgets.

D. Responses to Council Questions:

In response to a challenge to the assumption that it costs more to educate a student over a longer period of time, Dr. Vivona said faculty must become involved in communicating the realities of a changing world to legislators, and that Maryland legislators really do listen.

In response to a question regarding merit, versus COLA, bases for distribution of faculty salary enhancements, Dr. Vivona said the funds are intended for merit, but surmised that most presidents would provide some increase to all faculty.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Alternate Members By-Law Amendment: The proposed Amendment to CUSF Constitution By-Laws, Article II.2.6., previously referred to committee, was returned with alternate forms of the constitutional amendment. Upon a ruling that the amendment as proposed by the Administrative Affairs Committee at the November 11 meeting was the motion on the floor, one councilor spoke in favor of the motion, arguing that the issue is enfranchising faculty, and that one-for-one alternate membership made it easier for larger delegations to be fully represented.

It was moved and seconded to substitute a revised version of Substitute Motion #1 as the main motion:

"Each UMS institution may designate a number of alternate delegates who are to be selected in the same manner that delegates are selected. Alternates shall be identified as first or second and shall represent absent CUSF members according to that designation. The number of alternate delegates shall not exceed the limits specified in the following table:

delegates	alternates
1	1
2	1
3	1
4	2

5 2
6 2

Any delegate who must miss a CUSF meeting is responsible for briefing the alternate prior to his/her attending that CUSF meeting. (A UMS institution shall be represented at a CUSF meeting by no more than its full complement of delegates.) The effective date of this change is Fall, 1997."

The Chair ruled that any amendments to the motion would require only a simple majority, while the final vote on the amendment to the By-Laws would require an absolute majority.

Arguments in favor of the motion were:

- It is not necessary for UMCP to have three alternates.
- A large number of alternates, and the consequent shuffling of members in and out, would make an already difficult job of doing business even more incoherent. What is needed is a strong a level of commitment from the members, and this motion is a reasonable compromise between the original motion and need for commitment and coherence.
- We need not only representation, but informed representation, and a smaller number of alternates increases the likelihood they would function as informed representatives.

Arguments opposed to the motion were:

- The original motion is preferable because this reduction in number of alternates does not address the issue or solve the problem of providing full representation of an institution's faculty.
- A member's absence does not necessarily reflect a lack of commitment. Rather, it is a matter of a need to meet other obligations with a higher priority.
- Since one-to-one alternate representation is provided for the smaller delegations, the same ought to be true for the larger ones.

The motion to accept the Substitute Motion #1 as the main motion passed, with 14 in favor, 6 opposed.

A motion was made and seconded to amend the main motion by substituting the term "elect" for "designate" in the first line, and for "select" in lines 2 and 3. The motion passed, with 12 in favor, 5 opposed.

A motion was made and seconded to amend the main motion to change the number from "2" alternates to "3" alternates for 6-member delegations. The motion failed, with 4 in favor, 16 opposed.

As amended, the motion to amend the CUSF Constitution By-Laws, Article II.2.6. passed, with 19 in favor, none opposed, and 2 abstentions.

As amended, By-Laws Article II.2.6. reads:

"Each UMS institution may elect a number of alternate delegates who are to be elected in the same manner that delegates are elected. Alternates shall be identified as first or second and shall represent absent CUSF members according to that designation. The number of alternate delegates shall not exceed the limits specified in the following table:

delegates	alternates
1	1
2	1
3	1
4	2
5	2
6	2

Any delegate who must miss a CUSF meeting is responsible for briefing the alternate prior to his/her attending that CUSF meeting. (A UMS institution shall be represented at a CUSF meeting by no more than its full complement of delegates.) The effective date of this change is Fall, 1997."

The Chair will forward the By-Laws amendment to the UMS institutions for ratification.

B. Telecommunications Council Nominations: The Nominations and Membership Committee Chair nominated Dr. Kenneth Witmer (FSU) and Dr. Richard Swain (UB) to fill two of the three non-CUSF faculty positions on the Telecommunications Council. Council ratified the appointments unanimously.

C. Alternatives to Faculty Salary Increases: The Chair of the Faculty Development Committee moved acceptance of the following resolution as a response to correspondence from Vice Chancellor George Marx. As later amended, the motion was:

"While CUSF strongly supports improvements in quality of academic life (e.g., library materials and equipment), these improvements should not be a substitute for increases in faculty salaries. Therefore, CUSF continues to endorse the Regents' policy to bring salaries of all faculty in the UMS to the 85th percentile of relevant peer groups."

The Committee Chair noted that this motion was chosen as a more positive statement than that originally submitted as part of the committee report.

A motion was made and seconded to substitute the original motion submitted by the committee. The proffered rationale was that the original motion was a stronger, more appropriate response to a request that the costs of "academic-life enhancements" be funded from faculty salaries. The Faculty Development Committee Chair said Vice Chancellor Marx had orally clarified the source of the request as coming from a national organization seeking reaction

from UMS faculty, and that the proposal was not under discussion in UMS.

The motion to substitute the original phrasing failed, with 7 in favor, 9 opposed.

A motion was made, seconded, and passed to editorially amend the motion.

The main motion was passed unanimously.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A request was made that the Executive Committee send a letter supporting continuation of tenure at Baltimore Area Community Colleges. No action was taken.

X. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 1:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Wallinger

University of Maryland System
Council of University System Faculty
Minutes of the Meeting of Friday, January 24, 1997
University of Baltimore
Approved, as Amended, February 17, 1997

Present: Alexander (Chair); Arthur, CSC; Block (alt.), UMCP; Boberg, UMCP; Chapin, UMES; Cohen, UMCP; Davis, UMCP; Elam, BSU; Erskine, (alt.), SSU; Gill, UMBC; Glibert, CEES; Goldman, UMAB; Lasher, UMBC; Lomonaco, UMBC; Luchsinger, UB; Rebach, UMES; Rossi, SSU; Siegel, TSU; Shamoo, UMAB; Somers, TSU; Sternheim, UMCP; Strain, BSU; Trant, UMBI; Wallinger, FSU.

Absent With Prior Notice: Breslow, UMCP; Havas, UMAB; McClive, FSU; R. Smith, TSU;

Absent: Booth, UMAB; Ramchander, CSC; A. Smith, SSU; Vietri, UMCP.

Guests: Dr. Dan Gerlowski, UB; Regent Kevin Lawrence; Dr. George Marx, UMSA; UB President, Dr. H. Mebane Turner.

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

I. WELCOMING MESSAGES

Dr. Turner welcomed CUSF to the University of Baltimore campus, and noted the effective representation provided by current and past CUSF Chairs. He also noted twenty-three UB courses are being taught off campus, and that, while adaptation to distance education technology may be difficult, it is a necessity.

Council welcomed Dr. Thomas Erskine, the new alternate councilor from Salisbury State University.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the Minutes of the meeting of December 10, 1996, as submitted.

III. CHAIR'S REPORT

A. Agenda Changes: The Chair noted several modifications to the published agenda, including the substitution of Regent Kevin Lawrence as guest speaker, replacing Chancellor Langenberg, who could not attend due to required presence at budget hearings in Annapolis.

B. Report: The Chair referred Council to the written report, which notes BOR approval of the Regents' Faculty Awards; BOR debate on a draft policy reprioritizing the 1988 legislatively mandated enhancements; current UMS-proposed legislation (discussion deferred to Vice Chancellor and Committee Reports); highlights of present thinking about the FY 99 budget; and schedule of CUSF meetings for Spring, 1997.

The Chair called attention to two changes in the previously announced Spring CUSF schedule. The meeting at UMBI (CARB) has been changed to March 19, 1997 due to a conflict with a UMS conference on distance education. The Meeting at SSU has been changed to May 14, 1997 to avoid a conflict with the last day of Spring Semester classes.

The Chair reported that the MHEC FAC had begun a review of the responses to the MHEC Trends and Issues document, and that a report of initial reactions would be included in the packet of materials for the February meeting. The final MHEC report is due in May. FAC also spent considerable time discussing the question of proposed tenure-policy changes at the Baltimore Area Community Colleges.

The Chair noted a UMS white paper, distributed at Chancellor's Council, which details the arguments for the budget request for \$5 million for retention

and recruitment and retention of "stellar faculty" in UMS. Copies will be included in the next packet.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Executive Committee: The Chair referred Council to the previously distributed written report and to the minutes of the December Executive Committee meeting.

B. Educational Policy Committee: The Committee Chair reviewed the planning and agenda for a March 12 - 13, 1997 UMS Distance Education Conference and distributed copies of a set of questions addressing faculty concerns. The framework includes three sessions, each with plenary and "task" sessions. Session I will address the topic from a System perspective; Session II will focus on institutional concerns, including program development; and Session III will address faculty concerns. Reportedly, Chancellor Langenberg is anxious that the conference produce action in the form of policy recommendations and direction.

All campuses except CEES have been invited to send representatives, including one-to-three faculty. In light of potential overloading on an administrative perspective, Dr. Lasher urged councilors to contact their provost to ensure maximum faculty participation.

Given the timing, the Committee Chair suggested delaying the Ed. Policy Committee Report on Distance Education until after the conference. The Chair suggested the possibility of focusing the March CUSF meeting on the topic.

Discussion included the following points, among others:

- One councilor found it "shocking" that the second item in the list of questions of faculty concerns was the faculty reward system.
- Concern was expressed that the conference would initiate policy proposals without significant prior faculty involvement, either at the institutional or system levels.

V. VICE CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

A. Legislative Proposals: Vice Chancellor Marx identified three bills directly concerning UMS.

1. A Holiday-Schedule proposal is designed to provide more flexibility to UMS institutions, and there seems to be little opposition.

2. Retirement Incentives: It has gone through mark up with no substantive changes from the proposal submitted by UMS. For staff, the benefits

and provisions are the same as those provided in SB1 to other state employees. For faculty in a state retirement system, those who are age 60, with 25 years service, are eligible to apply between July 1 and August 31, 1997, and retire by July 1, 1998. For faculty positions, there would be no loss of positions. UMS must "make whole" the retirement-system fund to the extent of "lost" contributions for retiring employees. It will be possible for an institution to defer up to one half of the early retirements for one year, if necessary to avoid significant program disruption.

During subsequent discussion, concern was expressed that isolated departments might be hit hard by retirements and that there ought to be some system or institutional aid provided to those departments.

3. Name Changes: There seems to be little opposition to changing names to University System of Maryland, Towson University, and University of Maryland Center for Environmental Sciences.

B. UMS Budget: Dr. Marx reported that the current budget proposal calls for a 3.7% increase over FY 97 funds, including an additional \$5 million (over and above the Vision III funding plan) for the first year of a two-year plan for achieving national eminence via recruitment and retention of outstanding faculty. From a UMS perspective, \$2.5 million would go to UMCP, with the rest allocated to the other campuses, except UMAB. This would amount to approximately 50% of the funds needed to achieve the Regents' goal of faculty salaries at the 85th percentile of peer groups. The Governor has endorsed the proposal and reportedly plans to submit a request for an additional \$5 million next year.

During subsequent discussion, Dr. Marx said legislators are concerned that the funds be used for retention and recruitment of stellar faculty, not for across-the-board salary raises, and that approval of the second \$5 million for FY'99 may be contingent on demonstration of such use of the proposed current funds. Consequently, according to Dr. Marx, UMS has promulgated a set of guidelines for institutions to use in developing policies for distribution of the funds. While specific needs and the definitions of "stellar faculty" will vary by institution, there is a need for some consistency. Thus, according to Dr. Marx, Chancellor Langenberg has suggested that the funds should go to no more than 10%-to-20% of the faculty. A councilor commented that, though this may not improve salaries for all faculty, it is the first major step toward that goal in a long time. Dr. Marx responded that these funds may improve salaries for a larger number of faculty by freeing-up other funds for that purpose.

C. Other Items: Dr. Marx also noted that:
-- Thanks to Dr. Ira Block, UMS is "on the brink" of developing a faculty contract.

- CUSF needs to appoint a representative to the committee determining the Regents' Faculty Awards.
- In response to a CUSF Executive Committee request, Chancellor Langenberg has notified the presidents of the need to develop institutional shared-governance policies, and to submit a report on the process of developing the policies by May 23, 1997.

VI. PRESENTATION ON ECONOMIC VALUE OF UMS TO THE STATE

A. Overview: Dr. Dan Gerlowski provided a slide presentation of an ongoing study by the Jacob France Center, University of Baltimore, on the economic impact on the State of Maryland of UMS graduates. Unlike most studies of university impact, this project examines the economic impact of the increased earnings power of UMS graduates who currently are employed in Maryland. To do so, for purposes of the study they defined the term "Incremental Income," as "The portion of income earned that may be attributed to holding successively higher degrees." The study calculates the earnings premiums of Bachelors Degrees over High School, Masters over Bachelors, PhD. over Masters, and First Professional Degree of Bachelors. The study excludes those who are self employed and those working for governmental agencies.

B. Preliminary Findings: Analysis of the data provided, among others, the following preliminary findings:

- There are positive increments for all degree categories, with the largest increments for First Professional and Bachelors degrees.
- The average total 9-year incremental income for 1986 UMS Bachelors graduates is \$90,430.
- The average total 6-year incremental income for 1989 UMS Bachelors graduates is \$58,138.
- For all 1986 UMS graduates, the "discounted cumulative stream of lifetime increase in earnings and Maryland taxes paid for all individuals" totals \$2,077,205,693.49, and \$153,962,486.00, respectively.
- For all 1989 UMS graduates, the "discounted cumulative stream of lifetime increase in earnings and Maryland taxes paid for all individuals" totals \$2,023,010,877.19, and \$149,905,566.22, respectively.
- Dr. Gerlowski said one preliminary calculation was that there is a 5.2% rate of return on the state's investment in UMS.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Rewording of Alternate Member By Law: The Chair reviewed the Executive Committee discussion of editorial revision of the By Law amendment approved at the December meeting, and referred Council to the Executive Committee Report for alternate phrasings of the By Law: the approved version, with a condensed table of allowed number of alternates, and a reworded version,

intended to provide smoother language.

A motion was made and seconded to substitute the reworded version for the version approved at the December 10 CUSF meeting.

The motion failed.

VIII. COMMITTEE REPORTS (Continued)

A. Educational Policy Committee: The Committee Chair reported that the committee will meet on February 14, and will report to the February 17 CUSF meeting any potential recommendations for CUSF position to be advanced at the March 12-13 Distance Education Conference.

B. Legislative Affairs Committee: The Committee Chair distributed copies, and reviewed significant points of, the Report from the State Relations Council meeting of January 17, 1997. In addition to information provided by Dr. Marx, the following points were noted:

- Regarding the Early Retirement bill, due to legislative opposition, rehiring of retirees on a part-time basis probably will not be permitted.
- Regarding the \$5 million for recruitment and retention of outstanding faculty, there is some doubt about the likely success of this proposal. All Regents, UMSA personnel and presidents will emphasize the necessity of this appropriation, and faculty are urged to individually contact their delegates and senators.
- The General Assembly is very concerned about continued tuition increases above the level of increases in the cost of living. One chart shows state appropriations for UMS increasing, prompting legislators to ask why tuition also has been increasing at current levels.
- The UMS budget for FY '98 is finally back to the level of FY'91, in "actual" dollars, leaving it approximately 20% less than the 1991 level in real dollars.
- There is a distinction to be drawn between positive support for the UMS budget and reluctance to approve the \$5 million for "stellar faculty."

At a later point, the Committee Chair reported that a Budget Analyst report is recommending that, except for UMCP, UMBC, and UB, the UMS institutions be relieved of the requirement to submit annual workload reports.

IX. DISCUSSION WITH STUDENT REGENT, KEVIN LAWRENCE

A. Opening Comments: Regent Lawrence expressed appreciation for the opportunity to address CUSF and noted that faculty, both at the institutional level and in CUSF, are the most important group for building and maintaining a collegial, family atmosphere in the System.

B. Councilor Questions and Reactions by Regent Lawrence: Discussion items included the following:

In response to a question about student/student-leader reaction to the issue of distance education, Regent Lawrence identified two student concerns. He said, first, students are concerned that faculty using distance education technologies be properly trained in their use. Second, he said students are strongly committed to the position that distance technologies should be used to extend opportunities for student access to UMS campuses, but not to limit opportunities for those students who can get to the physical campuses and take courses in the traditional sense and modes of instruction.

A councilor asked how student-faculty human relationships could be improved, thereby reducing the potential for small, individual problems becoming institutional or system issues. Regent Lawrence suggested one part of the solution was full commitment to shared governance, including an institutional body with representatives from faculty, administration and student constituencies. He also suggested a need for a student ombudsman to provide an outlet for resolution of problems before they escalate to a higher level.

In response to the expressed belief that UMS alumni are not using their personal political power to help UMS, Regent Lawrence said it might be desirable to have a more coordinated effort by the UMS State Relations and Development personnel to seek political, as well as financial support from the alumni.

In response to expressed concern that opposition to tuition increases is based on faulty understanding of the true increases in operating costs facing higher education, Regent Lawrence suggested the solution may partially lie in increased administrative and faculty contact with legislators during the off season, as well as increased lobbying while the General Assembly is in session.

In response to a question of what he would like to see done to make UMS more "student friendly," Regent Lawrence said that a major problem is that students aren't aware of the proper channels or resources available to address an issue.

A councilor noted that major resources are devoted to supplying student support services that didn't exist 15 - 20 years ago, and asked whether there was any system data available on the total cost and source of funding of those services. Regent Lawrence replied that he didn't know, but would find out and inform the Chair.

In closing, Regent Lawrence noted that the primary BOR activity right now is lobbying for the UMS proposals in Annapolis, especially efforts to protect the budget and obtain approval of the \$5 million faculty salaries proposal. In that regard, he said he believes students can be uniquely helpful in pursuing

the argument that additional money is needed to retain the best faculty.

X. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 2:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael J. Wallinger

University of Maryland System
Council of University System Faculty
Minutes of the Meeting of Monday, February 17, 1997
University of Maryland at Baltimore
Approved, as Amended, March 19, 1997

Present: Alexander (Chair); Arthur, CSC; Block (alt.), UMCP; Boberg, UMCP; Breslow, UMCP; Chapin, UMES; Cohen, UMCP; Davis, UMCP; Erskine, (alt.), SSU; Gill, UMBC; Goldman, UMAB; Havas, UMAB; Lasher, UMBC; Lomonaco, UMBC; Luchsinger, UB; McClive, FSU; Ramchander, CSC; Rebach, UMES; Siegel, TSU; Shamoo, UMAB; Somers, TSU; Sternheim, UMCP; Strain, BSU; Swaim, UB; Trant (alt.) UMBI; Wallinger, FSU.

Absent With Prior Notice: Rossi, SSU; R. Smith, TSU;

Absent: Booth, UMAB; Elam, BSU; Glibert, CEES; Jagus, UMBI; A. Smith, SSU; Vietri, UMCP.

Guests: Regent Edwin Crawford; Dr. George Marx, UMSA;

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

I. WELCOMING MESSAGES

A. Dr. Richard Swaim was introduced and welcomed as a new member of Council from the University of Baltimore.

B. President Dr. David Ramsay welcomed Council to the UMAB campus and noted that the state capital budget had been kinder than the operating budget, as evidenced by the construction of Library and Nursing School facilities on either side of the Student Union, where the meeting was being held, and work on a new wing of the Hospital. He said the growth in grant funding, projected to rise to \$150 million next year, is attributable to the improvement in facilities.

When asked for his assessment of the current legislative session, he responded that it was very difficult to do so this year, due to the multiple

program and tax-cut proposals under consideration. He noted a belief that Governor Glendening is somewhat disappointed that there had not been a ground swell of support for his Hope Scholarship proposal. Dr. Ramsay said he believes opposition is not to the proposal itself, but to concern about how to pay for the program and still cut taxes, and that it is being tied up in different executive and legislative agendas. He also said that, in light of the large debts incurred by medical school students, he approves proposals which would reduce the total of graduate and undergraduate debt incurred by the students.

Dr. Ramsay said all the UMS presidents were arguing very hard for the proposed increase for faculty salaries, but also expressed disappointment that, at the moment, it was being proposed as one-time money, rather than being added to the base. He said it was "a bit beyond" him that there would be funds to improve competitiveness in faculty salaries one year, then have it taken back the next.

When asked about the future of the University of Maryland Graduate School at Baltimore, he projected continuation because of the need to advance collaborative programs.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of January 24, 1997 were corrected to note Councilor Strain (BSU) was present and Councilor Havas (UMAB) was absent with prior notice. A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the Minutes of the meeting of January 24, 1997, as amended.

III. CHAIR'S REPORT

The Chair referred Council to the previously distributed written report and elaborated on two points. He noted that several regents had reacted positively to his comments at their meeting in Annapolis, and had indicated that, while neither the Board of Regents nor the General Assembly had any problems with tenure, the issue does occasionally arise in concerns expressed by the general public. He also noted that there were positive reactions to his statements that the increasing cost of higher education was not primarily induced by faculty salaries.

In response to a question regarding the Budget Analyst's recommendation regarding workload reports, the Chair deferred to the chair of the Legislative Affairs Committee, who reported that the General Assembly was likely to accept the recommendation that, except for UMCP, UMAB, and UB, UMS institutions no longer be required to submit workload reports to the General Assembly.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Executive Committee: Except for E-mail correspondence to set the Council Agenda and discuss officer-election procedures, the Executive Committee did not meet in January.

B. Education Policy Committee: The committee chair distributed copies of a report of the February 14 committee meeting addressing distance education, and invited Council to examine the report prior to Council discussion of the topic scheduled for later in this meeting.

C. Administrative Affairs Committee: The committee chair noted the availability of information and registration materials for a "Lilly Conference on College and University Teaching" to be held at Towson State University April 4 - 6, 1997, and invited Councilors to attend.

D. Legislative Affairs Committee:

1. Hope Scholarships: The committee chair reviewed the basic features of the Governor's Hope Scholarship proposal (SB 231), noting that it would provide free tuition plus \$200 for books at a Maryland higher education institution to all Maryland high school graduates who graduate with a B average, and who maintain the B average in college. Council action on a letter of support for the proposal was deferred to the New Business portion of the agenda.

2. SB 749: UMUC Formula Funding: The committee chair summarized the basic features of Senate Bill 749, which proposes formula funding for UMUC in the amount of 10% of the previous-year general fund FTE appropriation for the state's four-year public institutions, rising 2% per year to 20% in FY 2005. This compares to a 14% formula funding for the independent colleges and universities, and would aid UMUC in achieving a competitive parity with the independents. SB 749 does not propose a commensurate increase in the UMS appropriation. In light of scheduled hearings before the Budget and Taxation Committee, the committee chair sought instructions from Council regarding participation in those hearings.

Motions were made and approved to suspend the Orders of the Day and move to committee-of-the-whole for discussion of appropriate instructions to the Legislative Affairs Committee regarding SB 749. While in committee-of-the-whole, discussion focused on concerns regarding the source of funds and the negative impact on other UMS institution budgets, faculty status at UMUC, UMUC adherence to COMAR regulations regarding full time faculty, and whether it is advisable for CUSF to take a position and/or testify before the Budget and Taxation Committee. Upon coming out of committee-of-the-whole for the Vice Chancellor's Report, no action was taken.

V. VICE CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

A. Legislative Proposals: Vice Chancellor Marx reported on two bills not previously discussed by CUSF. One proposes that if an institution requires a foreign language for graduation, American Sign Language would be mandated as an option to fulfill that requirement. UMS opposed the bill in testimony, not because of opposition to the substance, but because it constitutes legislative intrusion into the curricular decision making process.

The second concern was a provision of the welfare reform bill requiring higher education institutions to provide credit and/or money for student internships and volunteer activity in institutions. While UMS institutions already do so, UMS opposes the provision because it places the onus on the institutions for creating such activities, because it intrudes on institutional curricular decisions, and because of onerous reporting responsibilities.

In response to a question of the UMS position on the proposed formula funding for UMUC, Dr. Marx replied that Regent Billingsly had sent a letter supporting the concept, but also noting that it was not possible to fund the proposal from the UMS allocation.

In response to a question on UMS position on the Hope Scholarship proposal, Dr. Marx responded that UMS is "extremely supportive" of the proposal. The Regents believe it is important to support the initiative because of the long-term funding impact on UMS. In the out years, the scholarship funds would be allocatable for improved UMS funding. The Chair added that CUSF was being asked by the Governor to support the bill as a form of support for a "pro-education" governor.

Concern was expressed about the overly-restrictive approach specifying the types of documentation allowed for demonstrating spousal and dependency relationships for state benefits programs. Discussion suggested some campuses are allowing a greater variety of documents (e.g. income tax returns). Dr. Marx said he would check on the matter.

VI. DISCUSSION WITH REGENT EDWIN CRAWFORD

A. Opening Comments: Following introduction by the Chair, who noted that Regent Crawford Chairs the Finance Committee, is a member of the Advancement Committee, and has helped lead efforts to gain legislative approval of the UMS budget, Regent Crawford summarized his professional background in municipal finance and public administration.

B. Major Issues and Responses to Questions:

1. Regents' Role: Regent Crawford said that, culturally and philosophically, the current Board of Regents has assumed a more proactive role in developing and advancing UMS interests, thus regaining credibility in the legislature. He said that, rather than trying to micro-manage UMS, the BOR role is to act as a catalyst in challenging the presidents, assure that the institutions are managed, and to take on larger issues. He emphasized that one of the issues the Regent's are not challenging is the matter of tenure. Instead they are arguing to the legislature that the faculty are, indeed, productive, that tenure is needed to protect those productive faculty, and that, as professionals, the faculty use peer review to manage themselves and assure that tenure is not a free ride.

2. Capital Budget: Regarding the capital budget, Regent Crawford said the responsibility of the Finance Committee is to engage in long term planning to meet prioritized capital improvement needs of the campuses, within limited resources, and to persuade the Governor and General Assembly to assume a portion of the costs. At a later point he said that the Regents have fought for placing academic priorities first. He said for example, that if forced to choose between maintaining/enhancing the Chemistry program at UMCP and funding a new Cole Fieldhouse, the Regents would delay issuing bonds for the Fieldhouse.

3. Operating Budget/Vision IV: Regarding the operating budget, Regent Crawford said there probably will be a Vision IV to guide long term planning, rather than the traditional pattern of the Board considering only the allocation of incremental funding. In that light, he noted the need to grapple with tough choices in the context of limited funds, including, among others: "under-utilized" programs identified by MHEC; new programs; allocations for Regents' priorities, such as technology training and maintenance of institutional parity; and addressing the original legislative mandates, such as enhancement of the "flagship" and HBI's.

At a later point Regent Crawford returned to the issue of setting priorities as the major focus of Vision IV, arguing that all of the "christmas-treed" goals and legislative mandates could not be met simultaneously. He said it was in that vein that the original \$5 million faculty salary proposal was intended to bring UMCP up to the 85th percentile in FY 1998, with others to be addressed in subsequent years.

Regent Crawford emphasized that a major problem was that the State never funded the original mandates at a level necessary to achieve them. He noted that, on a nominal-dollar basis, each institution is still below the 1990 appropriation, and while there have been small increments in recent years under the Glendening administration, we are still way behind. In addition, he said when he testified on the matter of tuition increases before the Budget and Taxation Committee, he reminded them that, not only had previous cuts not been

restored, but that the state also had transferred to the UMS budget nearly \$100 million of operating expenses that formerly were picked up by the state. The result is a "double whammy" of lost revenue and increased operating expenses, thus putting the squeeze on endowments and tuition.

Later, Regent Crawford was asked to elaborate on the matter of "under-utilized programs." In response, he noted that MHEC monitors and reports on the number of graduates from programs, with implications, in his interpretation, that programs either need change, different marketing or possible deletion. When there is pressure on the budget, he said, programmatic priorities need to be set. He added that the response needs to emanate from the presidents, deans and faculty rather than from the Regents. He said that, unlike the Vision II approach of cutting for financial survival, Vision IV is likely to be a matter of examining programs in order to plan for the projected enrollment increases.

4. Tuition: Regarding tuition, Regent Crawford said the Regents are re-examining policy with the intent of giving institutions more flexibility. He said differentials are needed, depending on the nature and mix of programs, and that it would be a mistake to have legislative determination of tuition policy for each campus.

5. Collaboration: Regent Crawford said the Regents feel very strongly about the need for greater institutional collaboration, citing as an example the need to facilitate transfers among UMS institutions, especially in the same program, such as Business Administration. He also cited the upcoming standardized electronic application form, the Financial Management Information System, and Student Information System as examples of long-overdue progress in this area. At a later point he noted the need to encourage and reward faculty involvement in collaborative efforts; otherwise, he said, programmatic collaboration probably will not occur.

When asked later for suggestions on how to facilitate expanded funding of collaborative faculty research awards, Mr. Crawford reiterated his point that the proposals need to come from the faculty in order to work. Citing Business and Engineering program collaboration, he suggested that when proposals are put together at the department/dean levels, faculty are more likely to buy into them and that UMS can then become involved in facilitating the allocation of resources from the involved constituencies.

At a later point, Regent Crawford agreed with the view that collaboration is needed to reduce the proliferation of disciplinary sub-specializations across the UMS institutions, and elaborated on the point with the example of the coordination of Business Administration programs.

6. Advising: Regent Crawford also noted concern about the lack of

standardization of academic advising. Citing a "non-statistical sample" of discussions with students, he said he would only rate the System at C+, and suggested technology may be helpful in bringing improvement in faculty productivity as well as the advising process itself.

Later it was suggested that there is only anecdotal evidence regarding the nature of advising problems, and that it doesn't account for such factors as the impact of multiple program changes by students. In response, Mr. Crawford reiterated his point that technology can provide an easier, time efficient approach; the objective would be to provide a better, cheaper and faster way to do it. In response to a suggestion that we need to address greater student responsibility, he acknowledged that technology would not solve all problems, but could help.

Later, a councilor noted that a technological solution to advising problems would require major outlays for equipment, support and training. Mr. Crawford acknowledged the problem and added that, in special cases, it may be better to subscribe to commercial servers, such as AOL, than to invest in systems.

7. Adjunct Faculty: A Councilor noted that the downsizing which has come as a part of cost containment is resulting in a growing number of full time non-tenure-track faculty; suggested that, as the private sector has discovered, downsizing creates significant problems of inequity and quality; and asked whether there is any intent to fashion a System policy for faculty similar to the recently-adopted Contingent Employee policy. Mr. Crawford responded that Vice Chancellor Marx and Regent Finan were addressing the issue, noted the need for flexibility to address the circumstances facing different campuses and programs, and reiterated the need to attend to quality issues when addressing cost containment. Dr. Marx said that the question of part time and adjunct faculty was one example of the issues that need to be addressed by Vision IV as UMS comes to grips with parameters not faced by competitors using electronic distance education technologies, such as Phoenix University. Regent Crawford elaborated further on the potential erosion of the UMS student base occasioned by competition from out-of-state distance education programs which do not need to adhere to MHEC or UMS policies, and said faculty must look at new delivery systems in order for UMS to remain competitive.

VII. COMMITTEE REPORTS (Continued)

A. Legislative Affairs Committee:

1. HB 1064 (Early Retirement): The committee chair reviewed the provisions of HB 1064, the UMS Workforce Flexibility Act for both staff and faculty positions, and noted that UMS suggested CUSF support would be

appropriate. Eligible faculty who are members of a state retirement system and who are age 60, could declare their early retirement intent between July 1 and September 30, 1997, with retirement to occur on or before June 30, 1998. Those with 25 years of creditable service would receive approximately an 8% increase in benefits. Depending on agreement with the institution, retirement could occur as early as January, 1998.

Concern was expressed that the return of 60% of the staff PIN positions could work an extreme hardship on some institutions. Dr. Marx replied that UMS is not overly concerned, given the projected number of eligible employees likely to exercise the option.

The committee chair asked for a sense of Council regarding an invitation to express support for the measure. Discussion included the following points, among others:

- Testimony or a letter of support would be in the best interests of faculty and would increase CUSF visibility.
- A letter of support may be more appropriate than testimony since that precludes being asked questions the committee chair may not be prepared to answer.
- It is disappointing that there are no provisions for more equitable treatment of faculty in TIAA-CREF. Thus, it is inappropriate to go on record with enthusiastic expressions of support.
- Any letter of support ought to express disappointment about the inequitable treatment of faculty in non-state retirement programs and the desire to address that issue next year.
- Pursuit of the issue of equitable treatment of faculty in TIAA-CREF ought to be pursued independently, and not be tied to support of this bill.
- The most appropriate approach may be to take no position on the bill.
- In the short term, the proposal requires additional institutional outlays to reimburse the state retirement systems for the additional benefits.

A motion was made and seconded that CUSF should take no position on HB 1064.

A substitute motion was made and seconded to instruct the Chair and the Legislative Affairs Committee Chair to send a letter to the Chancellor expressing CUSF support for HB 1064. The motion to accept the substitute motion passed, 11 in favor, 8 opposed. The motion to approve resolution passed, 14 in favor, 4 opposed.

2. HB 1065 (Retiree Cola Benefits): The Committee Chair reviewed the provisions of a bill to provide to members of the Teachers' Pension System and the Employees' Pension System cost of living adjustments based on the previous fiscal year's allowance, rather than the present formula which bases

cola's on the original allowance.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously passed to send a letter in support of the bill.

3. SB 749: UMUC Formula Funding: Council moved to committee-of-the-whole to continue discussion of appropriate instructions to the Legislative Affairs Committee regarding SB 749. Upon coming out of committee-of-the-whole the following motion was made and seconded: "The Executive Committee is directed to inform the Chancellor that it is the sense of the Council that if University of Maryland University College is allocated state funds under a capitation formula, that UMUC must operate under the same COMAR regulations as the other higher education institutions in Maryland."

A motion was advanced as a friendly amendment to the main motion that Council opposes capitation-formula funding for UMUC because University College does not currently have full time faculty and operate under COMAR regulations; and therefore it would be a disservice to the citizenry of the State of Maryland to provide them with funding, since we could not insure the quality of their offerings. The Chair ruled that the motion was not a friendly amendment, and therefore was out of order.

The main motion passed unanimously.

B. Membership and Elections Committee: The Committee Chair announced that Dr. Martha Siegel (TSU) had been nominated to serve as the CUSF representative and member of the K-16 Council, and that the Executive Committee had ratified Dr. Siegel's appointment. He also announced that the committee membership had been expanded with the addition of Dr. Stephen Havas (UMAB) and Dr. Derek Gill (UMBC).

The committee chair announced the following procedure for nomination and election of officers for next year: Nominations for all offices should be submitted prior to the March Council meeting, and nominations will be accepted from the floor at that meeting. Elections will be held at the April Council meeting. However, if there is more than one nominee for Chair, balloting for the Chair position will occur first, thereby allowing the person who was not elected to be considered for another Executive Committee position.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Hope Scholarship: Council moved to committee-of-the-whole to discuss the question of Council support for the proposed Hope Scholarship legislation. Discussion focused on the issues of impact on grade inflation, diversity, cost, access, time to degree, and support for a pro-education

governor. Upon coming out of committee-of-the-whole a motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously that: "CUSF endorses the Hope Scholarships as a way for the state to improve the access of Maryland students to higher education."

B. Documentation of Dependency: Previously expressed concern about the overly-restrictive approach specified for type of documentation allowed for demonstrating spousal and dependency relationships for state benefits programs was reiterated. It was decided that the Chair would contact the Chancellor, indicate the problems caused by restrictive practices on some campuses, and request instructions to the presidents to uniformly provide more flexibility and a procedure for assuring everybody is informed.

C. Distance Education: The Education Policy Committee Chair referred Council to the previously distributed committee report setting out a faculty point-of-view to be articulated at the March 12-13 Distance Education Symposium, and called special attention to the following committee positions:

- We should "resist legitimizing programs which do not require some element of "real" contact between the student and the campus culture" (i.e. interaction with faculty and peers beyond that provided by mediated technology).
- The committee argues that "program content, degree requirements, and degree certification must remain with real faculty in real academic departments and that programs and courses be subjected to the same review and approval mechanism as "standard" courses and programs. In no instance should distance education courses or programs be developed and approved outside of the existing academic structure of the university."
- "Faculty teaching courses mediated by distance technology should be recruited and hired by existing academic departments and subject to the same review and scrutiny as any faculty member in the USM."

Council discussion included suggestions that:

- The position statement ought to raise the question of the evaluating the quality of teaching and learning via distance education modalities.
- It is not necessary that UMS buy into every scheme for distance education. Instead, we ought to be very selective and pay special attention to maintaining quality.
- We need to pay special attention to examining the methodology of articles reporting comparatively better results for distance ed courses over courses offered in the traditional mode.
- Quality control can be maintained if departments retain program control in the normal academic manner.
- Experience suggests significant benefits can accrue to both faculty and students in distance education modalities.

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair announced that Dr. Marx had indicated to him that Vision IV is likely to come out sometime this Spring. The Chair agreed to pursue a suggestion that the Executive Committee protest such a rapid development of policy in light of the absence of a financial emergency.

The Chair announced that at the Chancellor's Council meeting the presidents sought to reopen the discussion of a new faculty contract. Reportedly, the presidents are particularly concerned with the issue of where tenure lies -- with institutions, departments, or elsewhere. The Chair agreed to relay to the Chancellor the sentiment that it is ill advised to first amend the BOR policy, and then come up with a contract for faculty.

X. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 2:27 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael J. Wallinger

**University of Maryland System
Council of University System Faculty
Minutes of the Meeting of Wednesday, March 19, 1997
UMBI - CARB**

Approved as Amended, April 16, 1997

Present: Alexander (Chair); Arthur, CSC; Block (alt.), UMCP; Chapin, UMES; Cohen, UMCP; Davis, UMCP; Elam, BSU; Erskine, (alt.), SSU; Gill, UMBC; Glibert, CEES; Goldman, UMAB; Havas, UMAB; Lasher, UMBC; Lomonaco, UMBC; Luchsinger, UB; McClive, FSU; Rossi, SSU; Siegel, TSU; Shamoo, UMAB; R. Smith, TSU; Somers, TSU; Strain, BSU; Trant (alt.), UMBI; Wallinger, FSU.

Absent With Prior Notice: Boberg, UMCP; Breslow, UMCP; Ramchander, CSC; Rebach, UMES; Swaim, UB.

Absent: Booth, UMAB; Jagus, UMBI; A. Smith, SSU; Sternheim, UMCP; Vietri, UMCP.

Guests: Dr. Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA; Dr. Kay Gilcher, Institute for Distance Education, UMUC.

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

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of February 17, 1997 were corrected to note Dr. Trant (alt.), UMBI was present. A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the Minutes

of the meeting of February 17, 1997, as amended.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Congratulations were extended to Councilor Jill Boberg (UMCP) on the birth of her son.

III. CHAIR'S REPORT

The Chair referred Council to the written report and discussed the following:

A. Regents' Faculty Awards: Chancellor Langenberg has approved a delay until May 1, 1997 as the deadline for submitting nominations for the Regents' Faculty Awards. The Chair will inform the campuses of the new nomination deadline.

B. MHEC Faculty Advisory Council: At the March 18 meeting, FAC discussed an MHEC draft report responding to the Hezel Report, a consultant's advice on state policy regarding distance education. The MHEC report ultimately will be included in the Issues and Trends document, thus setting state policy for control of distance education in higher education. The report has been withdrawn due to objection from an ad hoc work group, but is on a fast-track approval process, with a work group meeting on April 10, and MHEC final approval scheduled for its April meeting.

The Chair identified several major concerns, including the following:

- The absence of faculty input at any stage of generating and/or responding to the MHEC report was noted, leading the Chair to argue strongly, at the FAC meeting, for including faculty on the MHEC ad hoc work group. Dr. Giles-Gee noted a similar absence of prior input from UMS, and said that UMSA was now represented in the ad hoc work group.
- A section of the withdrawn report identifying UMUC as the model for distance education and proposing establishing UMUC as Maryland's virtual university for baccalaureate programs, prompted strong objections at the FAC meeting.
- The proposal involves MHEC in such matters as program and course approval, and the reward structure.

C. Non-Discrimination Policy: The Chair referred Council to a proposed UMS policy prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and noted that Chancellor's Council specifically requested CUSF reaction. The Executive Committee referred the matter to the Administrative Affairs Committee for drafting a response for Council consideration at the April meeting.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Executive Committee: The Chair referred Council to the written report and to the draft minutes of the February Executive Committee meeting, and noted that the non-discrimination policy may be discussed at a later point.

B. Legislative Affairs Committee:

1. Early Retirement: The Chair and Committee Chair reviewed recent developments and potential modifications to the Early Retirement bill (HB1064). The Committee Chair reported expressing strong objections to a proposed revision setting November 1, 1997 as an effective date for faculty retirement. Regarding a proposal by Senator Amos that a portion of the funds and positions of retiring faculty revert to the State, the Committee Chair sought the advice of Council for a contingency response. Options would include whether to withdraw CUSF support for the entire bill, and whether to oppose inclusion of faculty in the bill, thus retaining support for the staff-retirement provision.

2. Faculty Salaries: At a later point in the meeting Council continued the Legislative Affairs Committee report. At that time, the Committee Chair reported that the House had passed a budget with the UMS appropriation largely intact, but the Senate version cuts \$1 million from the \$5 million for faculty retention and recruitment. Frank Komenda, the UMS legislative liaison, has suggested a letter-writing campaign to augment UMS efforts to have the funds reinstated in the joint conference. To that end, a list of talking points was distributed and councilors were urged to write their senators and delegates. A question was asked whether the legislature regarded the faculty recruitment and retention funds as a part of the UMS/institutional base or as one-time-money, in which case it would constitute a major unfunded mandate for future years. The Committee Chair responded that both the House and Senate have approved the funds as a part of the total UMS budget, rather than as a separate item. Consequently, the answer depends on legislative action next year.

C. Nominations and Membership Committee: The Committee Chair reported that one nomination had been received for each of the executive committee positions:

Chair: Larry Lasher, UMBC.

Vice Chair: Steve Rebach, UMES.

Secretary: Ira Block, UMCP.

At Large Members: Marthe McClive, FSU, and Martha Siegel, TSU.

Since there were no nominations from the floor, nominations were closed. Elections will be held at the April CUSF meeting.

V. VICE CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

A. Chairpersons Workshop: Dr. Giles-Gee announced that the Department Chairpersons Workshop is scheduled for October 31, 1997, at UMUC, and that the intent is to work with the same people as last year on the planning Committee. Information will be sent to the Academic Vice Presidents in April. Registration will be limited to approximately 100 chairs.

B. Upper Division Courses at Community Colleges via Distance Education:
Dr. Giles-Gee reported that UMS has entered into discussions with MHEC regarding the brokering of upper division courses and baccalaureate programs offered by the community colleges. The intent of the discussions is to arrive at guidelines and policies governing cooperative agreements between community colleges and four-year institutions, including UMS institutions. Concern was occasioned by the increasing number of courses and programs being offered by distance learning technologies at the community colleges under cooperative agreements with out-of-state institutions. The most recent instance was Anne Arundel Community College's announcement to MHEC that it had entered into a three-year, FIPSE-funded partnership with Governor's State University (Illinois) to offer a competency-based GSU baccalaureate degree on site at AACC.

Dr. Giles-Gee further reported that the regional accrediting agencies are supportive of such programs, and are suggesting course/program accreditation reciprocity, whereby accreditation of a distance education program in one accrediting region would be accepted as an accredited program in the other regions. In response to a question regarding application of accrediting standards which vary by type of institution, Dr. Giles-Gee noted that technology had outstripped policy, thus making an answer impossible at this time.

It was noted that Montgomery College recently announced a similar agreement with UMUC to offer dual enrollment, thus allowing completion of a UMUC baccalaureate degree at Montgomery College. Dr. Giles-Gee noted that at least this agreement involved a UMS institution, and that, under the new admission policies, similar dual-admission articulated programs are available to all UMS institutions. It was noted that, in light of approximately 50% of new UMS students coming from the community colleges, dual-admission agreements with out-of-state institutions pose a significant threat to the enrollments of UMS institutions. In response to the question of why the community colleges had approached out-of-state institutions rather than a UMS institution, Dr. Giles-Gee said it is possible that it reflects historical attitudes arising from past relationships.

VI. PRESENTATION BY DR. KAY GILCHER, INSTITUTE FOR DISTANCE EDUCATION

A. Overview: Following introduction by the Chair, Dr. Gilcher provided an overview of the Institute for Distance Education. It was founded in 1990 to foster the use and development of distance education within UMS as a means of

meeting the needs of learners throughout Maryland, without program duplication. The current IDE mandate includes sharing resources and expertise across UMS institutions and other state agencies, and an advisory role to the Chancellor on UMS distance education policy.

B. Information/Resources Sharing: Sharing of information and resources is accomplished through distribution of "Linkages," a quarterly newsletter about activities within UMS and distance education developments in a broader arena, such as emerging internet-teaching technologies; specialized occasional publications, such as a manual for faculty designing and teaching courses on IVN; and a constantly-updated web site (<http://www.umuc.edu/ide.ide.html>) with links to distance education resources on the internet, models of distance education, and a faculty on-line forum. Dr. Gilcher noted that faculty can provide input and requests for attention to specific issues through their institution's representative to the IDE Advisory Council.

IDE also sponsors traditional and electronic workshops and conferences to meet the needs of UMS faculty and administrators. Past workshops have covered both conceptual and pedagogical/technological concerns. A May workshop on "The Potential of the Web" will address the challenges of designing and delivering university-level instruction on the world wide web. Dr. Gilcher noted that the May workshop will incorporate a participative format, and that enrollment is limited.

C. Policy Advisory Role: Dr. Gilcher identified co-sponsorship of the Symposium on Policy and Distance Education as the most recent example of filling the role of advisor to the Chancellor. It was designed as the beginning of a dialogue on how to respond as a system to a major challenge from around the country, as geographical barriers to meeting the educational needs of Maryland begin to disappear. The symposium outcome will be a "white paper," due out in May, which hopefully will stimulate continued dialogue within institutions and will recommend policy changes. After feedback from the institutions, the Chancellor will report to the Regents in the first quarter, 1998, on strategic recommendations for the next four-to-five years.

In response to a question of whether the symposium addressed the issue of in-state vs. out-of-state tuition rates, Dr. Gilcher said that was one of a number of issues addressed, but not resolved. A sample of other issues addressed by the conference included workload policies appropriate for new models of instruction; intellectual property for oft-repeated use of materials developed in the context of group-designed collaborative courses; cross registration of students in two or more UMS institutions; and institutional territoriality in a context of disappearing geographical determinants.

In response to a request for advice on the best way for CUSF to provide input to the Chancellor for the "white paper," Dr. Gilcher said IDE will be working with Gertrude Eaton, in the Chancellor's Office, to draft a document that will serve as a focus for response from faculty, administrators and system personnel. It was suggested that May-to-December, 1997 was an important time frame for active CUSF involvement.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. UMAB Salary Policy: UMAB Councilors reviewed the history of a now-tabled proposal regarding salaries for tenure-track Medical School faculty, and asked that the issue be considered an information item rather than an item for CUSF action.

B. Non-Discrimination Policy: The Chair distributed copies of a revised draft of "Proposed UMS Policy on Sexual Orientation;" noted that CUSF specifically had been asked to comment on the proposal; noted that the Administrative Affairs Committee had been charged with drafting a response for CUSF action and providing guidance for the Chair in BOR debate on the issue; and opened the floor to discussion.

Discussion centered on Section IV, Exclusions, which specifies that: "It is not prohibited discrimination under this policy to (1) observe the terms of any bona fide seniority or merit system or a bona fide employee benefit plan such as a retirement, pension, or insurance plan; (2) to adopt and comply with policies and procedures which recognize or create distinctions based on familial or spousal relationships; or (3) to enforce or comply with any federal, State, or county law, regulation, or guideline."

Council discussion included the following comments, among others:

- It is insulting that more time is devoted to specifying exclusions, than to what is covered by the policy.
- It may be more restrictive than current state law, since the exclusions may take precedence over the more flexible state law. Consequently, it may be preferable to have no UMS policy than to adopt this proposal.
- John Anderson, of the Attorney General's Office, reportedly drafted the policy to reflect his understanding of BOR policy implicitly set in the process of rejecting domestic-partner benefits.
- Councilors were urged to take the issue back to their campuses for discussion by the appropriate bodies and/or experts.
- Discussion with benefits personnel on one campus suggests that it may be bad policy per se, regardless of the exclusions specified in Section IV.
- It is a flawed document in the sense that attempts to impose legislatively on what is a matter of societal behavior.

The Chair requested that views and information be sent to him and to the Administrative Affairs Committee Chair, Councilor Somers. Preliminary discussion of an Administrative Affairs Committee response will be held in April, with final action tentatively set for the May Council meeting.

C. Benefits Documentation: Expressions of appreciation were extended to the Chair and Chancellor for the rapid response in providing flexibility in the form of documentation required for benefits and the timing of submission of the documentation.

D. Early Retirement: The Chair opened the floor to discussion of contingency directions to the Administrative Affairs Committee Chair in the event that the legislation is modified in such a way that funds and/or positions of retiring faculty would revert to the State. Discussion included the following comments, among others:

- Since loss of positions and/or funds would be disastrous for departments and the universities, we ought to withdraw support for the bill if there is a significant loss of funds and/or positions.
- We ought not take a position on the provision the bill as it applies to staff.
- As a representative of the faculty of an institution, one councilor found it inappropriate to oppose a benefit for eligible faculty.
- We need to consider the impact on the faculty who remain, as well as those who take advantage of the proposal.
- As a matter of equity, it is inappropriate to deprive staff of the opportunity provided to all other state employees last year.

By majority vote, it was the sense of Council to support exclusion of faculty from the bill if it entails a significant give back of funds and/or positions.

On a tie vote, it was the sense of Council to take no position on the bill as applied to staff retirements.

VIII. DISCUSSION OF DISTANCE EDUCATION:

A. Distance Education Symposium: The Chair noted attendance at the symposium by several councilors, and invited them to highlight issues of concern for CUSF.

Councilor Lasher, Education Policy Committee Chair, noted a reluctance to fulfill the original intent that the Committee would advance proposals for CUSF policy positions, and suggested the more appropriate route was to become involved in response to the upcoming draft UMS "white paper." He said the symposium broadened understanding of what is included under the label "distance

education;" noted frequent suggestions that we are on the verge of a paradigm shift in higher education, and that distance education is the rubric on which this shift is occurring; suggested we need to address a larger agenda than a focus on individual issues such as workload and faculty reward systems; and referred Council to a previously distributed identification of relevant larger issues, such as funding, missions, institutional structure, faculty roles, inter-institutional collaboration, shift from a teaching to a learning paradigm, and investment in high-cost, high-tech. infrastructure.

Councilor Siegel identified institutional missions, the breakdown of departmental barriers, encouraging intra-institutional collaboration, the role of faculty as impresarios, and the interface between students and the university as the primary concerns addressed in the Institutional Issues group. Also noted was an uneasiness based in the belief that some students need interaction with faculty and peers in order to learn well.

Councilor Arthur noted expressed concern for impact of articulation and transferability policies on academic programs, and attendant concerns for program quality control. For institutions in precarious financial situations, one possible consequence would be for some to go out of existence because of market competition, while another possibility would be to force institutions to engage in more collaborative programs. Also noted was the need for faculty development programs to retrain faculty and concern for the source of funds to support such development programs.

The Chair summarized the focus of the plenary-session speakers' attention to efforts to involve faculty, the historical evolution of higher education in the United States, and suggestions that we are entering a shift to "virtual universities" with distance education as a central feature. Whether it supplants or exists side-by-side with traditional approaches, it seems clear that change is coming and we must learn to adapt.

Dr. Giles-Gee noted that, in light of a projected 20% increase in high school graduates, access is a significant issue, and that California was using technology as a primary means of addressing the access issue.

B. Council Discussion of Issues: Council discussion addressed a wide variety of concerns, including the following, among others:

- An underlying assumption of major increases in non-traditional students seeking life-long-learning experiences was challenged, based on the point that the enrollment-increase projections are nearly all based on an increase in the number of 18-20 year olds.
- A distinction needs to be drawn between embracing new distance education technology as a financially feasible way of accommodating the coming wave of

enrollments, and embracing it in the mistaken belief that it is a superior substitute for face-to-face interaction. The obligation is to do what is in the best interest of the students.

-- If these predictions are accurate, it means that the mission statements which were painstakingly-developed a couple of years ago are now meaningless.

-- Given the characterization of departments as barriers to change, what is being proposed as a replacement?

-- Given the fact of \$10 - \$15 thousand for collaborative UMS faculty projects, and the advice that there are no additional funds in the UMSA budget, how is the projected major increase in collaborative programming to be funded?

-- It is inappropriate to abandon all we have learned about good education, especially since it is likely the new paradigm will exist side-by-side with the traditional paradigm, rather than replace it.

-- Concern was expressed about leaping into distance education without understanding the underlying assumptions of the enrollment projection documents, and on misunderstanding of socio-economic factors such as the effect of a declining standard of living.

-- The expressed assumptions that distance education cannot be quality education are wrong. There is some data to suggest that distance education can produce outcomes which are not only equal, but superior to, traditional modes of instruction. It is our responsibility as educators to embrace the state of the art and assure that every aspect of the learning experience is the best possible.

-- If UMS buys into this model, elements of institutional missions based on historical precedent and geography become irrelevant, and missions will become "what we do well."

-- It is a mistake to think in terms of a dichotomy between face-to-face instruction and sitting in front of a TV screen. One of the models presented at the conference combined computer, internet, interactive video, and a dedicated phone line as student-faculty links.

-- Given perceptions of the high cost of education, a central question will be whether we can meet the demand more cheaply. We may be able to do so eventually, but the start up costs are very high.

-- Most companies want to provide continuing education, but do not want to be in the education business, thus suggesting a major market for distance education.

-- Given limited resources we may not be able to do all that we have traditionally done, as well as meet demands for new services, such as providing continued post-baccalaureate training. It may be best to focus on what we have done best -- producing good basic research and disseminating the results.

-- The question is not how to resist the juggernaut, but how to retain the values of the liberalizing influence of education in the new paradigm.

-- The experience at UMBI, where all programs are conducted via distance technology, suggests high quality experiences can be achieved if the faculty commit the time and effort, but that distance education can be very expensive.

-- Concern was expressed that there seems to be no provision for a system of quality control to replace the current structure, whereby control is exercised by faculty at the departmental and institutional levels.

-- It was suggested that future issue discussions included attention to the nature of the future role of faculty; intellectual property; the use of existing facilities such as those in the school systems; and the need to retain tenured faculty in the face of a likely increase in non-tenure-track faculty.

C. Future CUSF Action: It was suggested that the most appropriate procedure for CUSF to address the policy issues is to wait for the "white paper" from the Chancellor, and use it as the basis for a formal input in the policy-formation process. It also was suggested that we need to engage the campus senates in the discussion in order to alert faculty to what is coming down and to gain a more representative point of view.

There was general agreement that Council is not yet ready to formulate a coherent position statement on the issues, and that more information is needed. To that end, the Chair will distribute the IDE summary of the symposium proceedings as soon as they become available, and will seek information on faculty-position statements from other states.

IX. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 2:27 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael J. Wallinger

University of Maryland System
Council of University System Faculty
Minutes of the Meeting of Wednesday, April 16, 1997
CEES - SOLOMONS
Approved as Amended, May 14, 1997

Present: Alexander (Chair); Arthur, CSC; Block, UMCP; Chapin, UMES; Cohen, UMCP; Erskine, (alt.), SSU; Gill, UMBC; Glibert, CEES; Goldman, UMAB; Jagus, UMBI; Lasher, UMBC; McClive, FSU; Rebach, UMES; Siegel, TSU; R. Smith, TSU; Strain, BSU; Swaim, UB; Wallinger, FSU; Wright (alt.), CEES.

Absent With Prior Notice: Boberg, UMCP; Davis, UMCP; Havas, UMAB; Luchsinger, UB; Ramchander, CSC; Rossi, SSU; Somers, TSU; Sternheim, UMCP;

Absent: Booth, UMAB; Elam, BSU; Lomonaco, UMBC; Shamoo, UMAB; A. Smith, SSU; Vietri, UMCP;

Guests: Dr. Helen Giles-Gee, UMSA; Dr. Kenneth Tenore, CEES.

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

I. WELCOMING MESSAGES

CEES Faculty Senate Chair, David Wright, extended a welcome to the Solomons campus, thanked councilors for input on the peer review standards and procedures, and introduced Dr. Kenneth Tenore, Chesapeake Biological Laboratory Director.

Dr. Tenore welcomed Council to CBL, the oldest of three CEES research campuses, and oldest state supported research facility in the Eastern United States; noted the recently approved name change to University of Maryland Center for Environmental Studies; and reviewed CEES' mission focus on a combination of "pure" and applied research, service, and outreach programs.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of March 19, 1997 were amended to correctly identify UMUC as the site of the Fall, 1997 Department Chairpersons Workshop. A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the Minutes of the meeting of March 19, 1997, as amended.

III. CHAIR'S REPORT

The Chair referred Council to the previously distributed written report and elaborated on several items and late-breaking events.

A. UMUC Representation in CUSF: The Chair reported on a recent meeting with UMUC President Massey, pursuant to Executive Committee decisions to air concerns on a variety of issues, especially the matter of UMUC representation in CUSF. Given the CUSF membership limitation to tenure-track faculty who are elected by an institution's faculty, no faculty at UMUC can qualify. It was reported that UMUC will not change its structure or behavior in order to obtain CUSF representation, and that, consequently, CUSF is faced with a decision whether to adopt some informal procedure for UMUC input to CUSF deliberations. In response to a question of UMUC adherence to the UMS Shared Governance Policy, the Chair reported that UMUC firmly believes it has a shared governance policy in operation, and that CUSF review power is limited to input, and does not include veto power.

The Chair sought advice of Council whether the Executive Committee should explore optional avenues for providing UMUC input into CUSF proceedings. While general opinion was that Executive Committee should investigate options, strong objection was raised to potentially jeopardizing an individual UMUC faculty member by inviting CUSF attendance, since the last two UMUC representatives to CUSF had been fired.

B. Regents' Responses to Chair's Comments: The Chair expanded on written reference to the Regents' comments welcoming faculty leadership in distance education. The Chair had noted that CUSF intent was to respond to the forthcoming "White Papers" on the recent Distance Education Conference, and Regent Billingsly reportedly responded very positively, inviting CUSF to take a lead role in forming UMS policy.

C. Legislative Actions/Legislative Affairs Committee Report: The Chair and the Legislative Affairs Committee Chair reviewed the legislative approvals and defeats.

Proposals passed by the General Assembly included:

- Prepaid Tuition Plan.
- Welfare Reform proposal stipulating that higher education institutions work with individuals coming off welfare.
- The UMS Budget, largely intact.
- \$4.5 million for retention and recruitment of outstanding faculty. The institutional allocations are: UMCP - \$2,250,00; BSU - \$166,320; TSU - \$574,560; UMES - \$75,600; FSU - \$533,520; CSC - \$71,280; SSU - \$287,280; UMBC - \$451,440; CEES - \$90,000. The Chair also summarized a memo from the Chancellor setting guidelines on distribution of the funds, generally restricting the number of eligible faculty, and establishing reporting requirements necessary for monitoring the distribution.

Proposals not approved by the General Assembly included:

- Holiday Leave bill.
- Hope Scholarship proposal (Defeated because of cost, but likely to be reintroduced next year as part of a general reexamination of scholarships).
- Technology Transfer proposal requiring a %25 reduction in royalties transfer from Maryland firms.
- Out-of-State tuition rates for students from families with incomes above \$70,000.
- Formula funding for UMUC.
- Guarantees of computer privacy for employees.
- Prohibition on use of state scholarships, grants or loans for study abroad.
- Workforce Flexibility Act (early retirement) was locked up in Rules Committee, thus failing approval on a procedural basis, rather than on its merits. UMS intent is to reintroduce the measure next year.
- Tuition Cap proposal.
- Requiring acceptance of sign language as a foreign language equivalent.

D. Chancellor's Council: The Chair elaborated on several issues addressed at the April 7 joint meeting of Presidents Council and Chancellor's Council.

1. Out-Of-State Programs at Community Colleges: Like everybody else, the

presidents are wrestling with the issue of programs and degrees offered via distance education technology. Reportedly, the UMUC-Montgomery College arrangement is not as significant an issue as initially suggested, since the articulation agreement has been in force for several years. However, considerable concern was expressed regarding agreements between community colleges and out-of-state institutions, such as that between Anne Arundel Community College and Governor's State (Illinois). Since 80 credits would be offered by AACC, and Governor's State would be paying AACC faculty to teach the remaining 40 credits, the agreement effectively makes AACC a 4-year institution.

2. MICUA Proposals: The Maryland Independent College and University Association (MICUA) has proposed several distance-education related policy changes to MHEC. One proposes elimination of "duplication" as a criterion for MHEC approval to offer existing programs via distance education technology. Another proposes a 5-year moratorium on MHEC approval requirements for new in-state programs offered via distance education technology. A third proposes a "right of first refusal" to Maryland universities and greater cooperation among Maryland public and private institutions in meeting competition from out-of-state institutions. A straw vote by the presidents revealed some support for the MICUA proposals.

3. Junior Faculty Project: The presidents reacted positively to the proposed study of junior faculty perceptions of their role and barriers to advancement, as detailed in a proposal submitted by Councilor Somers. Several presidents also sought expansion of the project to include non-tenure-track faculty, necessitating a new proposal. The Chair suggested that before such a document was prepared, CUSF needs to focus the questions and desired outcomes more carefully.

Recent events at UB prompted a suggested focus on the question of contract renewal/nonrenewal for untenured tenure-track faculty. Council reactions ranged from elaboration of the issue to suggestion that this was a separate issue, unrelated to the original intent of the study.

Another Councilor suggested focusing on the impact of the trend to rely increasingly on soft money to fund faculty research and salaries. It was argued that such a trend blurs the distinction between non-tenure-track and tenure-track faculty, and, as increasing time is devoted to grant writing, raises serious questions of variation in expectations in the teaching, service and research evaluation components.

The Chair invited Councilors to send reactions and proposed focus points to him for Executive Committee discussion.

4. K-16 Initiative: The Chair noted that, with one reservation, the presidents

had endorsed the K-16 Initiative, and raised the question whether CUSF wished to similarly endorse it. Dr. Giles-Gee suggested a particularly relevant concern for faculty would be involvement in defining the "core knowledge" for the various disciplines. The Chair suggested the Executive Committee will address the issue and reintroduce the question at a later Council meeting.

E. Fulltime UMUC Faculty: At a later point in the meeting, the Chair reported that MHEC FAC has requested that MHEC reopen the questions of the number of fulltime faculty at UMUC, and adherence to the COMAR requirement that 50% of classes be taught by fulltime faculty.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Executive Committee: The Chair referred Council to the written report.

B. Nominations and Membership Committee: The Committee Chair presented the slate of nominees for 1997-98 officers and Executive Committee members-at-large:
Chair: Larry Lasher, UMBC.
Vice Chair: Steve Rebach, UMES.
Secretary: Ira Block, UMCP.
At-Large Members: Marthe McClive, FSU, and Martha Siegel, TSU.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved to elect the slate by acclamation.

C. Faculty Development Committee: It was reported that the committee will be meeting soon to consider the collaborative faculty development grants, and the CUSF charge to examine the larger question of ways to encourage faculty collaboration.

V. PRESENTATION ON UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND ACADEMIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

A. Overview: As Chair of the Telecommunications Council, Dr. Kenneth Tenore reviewed the history of the organization, from its early-90's initiation as a response to a shift in funding from UMSA to shared funding by the campuses, through the evolution of technology and expansion of responsibilities, to its current purview. The Council oversees the academic component of UMS telecommunications, including Internet connections and development of the infrastructure for IVN sites and services. The 26-member Council includes representatives from each campus and from various other groups, such as the libraries, CUSF, and the Academic Vice Presidents. A newsletter, "UMS Online," recently was initiated as a channel to inform UMS of the Council's activity, and yearly retreats have started in order to engage in long-range planning and to set priorities. Beyond the decision that academic uses take precedence,

unresolved issues include the question of number of IVN sites per institution, whether to allow access by non-UMS institutions, and how to balance undergraduate and graduate education uses.

B. Questions and Comments:

In response to the question whether UMATS intended to expand from concern for connections, hardware and infrastructure, to involvement in the discussion of the role of distance education in UMS, Dr. Tenore responded that many of the policy questions are campus issues, and that UMATS does not have the right to intrude at that level. He added that UMATS cooperates with the Institute for Distance Education, and gave as an example the request that IDE investigate the question of the ethics of recording class sessions without the permission of students, as well as faculty, appearing in the recorded sessions.

In response to a question whether UMATS has policy-making or advisory authority, Dr. Tenore said the charter establishes policy making authority in its oversight role, but defers other matters to the campuses.

In response to a question whether UMATS intends to establish UMS policy regarding classroom materials prepared by faculty, Dr. Tenore replied that such concerns were outside both the mandate and expertise of the Council. He added that the Council has requested advice from IDE and the Academic Vice Presidents regarding what might be put on the UMATS home page. In response to a follow up question, he said a recommendation was to destroy materials at the end of a semester, rather than archive them.

In response to a question of the wisdom of campuses creating a Chief Information Officer position, Dr. Tenore said he approves the idea, and that the Chancellor is establishing such a position at the System-level and considering the establishment of a council of campus information officers. Dr. Giles-Gee added that the search for the Associate Vice-Chancellor for Information and Technology should be completed by this Summer, and that most of the distance education policy decisions are made at the level of the MHEC Segment Heads.

VI. VICE CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

A. Early Retirement Bill: Dr. Giles-Gee confirmed earlier reports that UMS intends to resubmit the Early Retirement bill for the 1998 legislative action.

B. Nondiscrimination Policy: Dr. Giles-Gee announced that, following a meeting with John Anderson (Attorney General's Office) it was decided to redraft the proposed UMS policy on sexual orientation. The new draft is expected in early May and will be considered at the July BOR meeting.

C. Faculty Development Grants: Dr. Giles Gee distributed copies of RFP applications for faculty development mini-grants intended to encourage faculty to work jointly with business or industry in curriculum development projects that incorporate school-to-careers strategies. May 9, 1997 is the application deadline for the \$1,500 - \$2,500 grants, which are funded by the Maryland State Department of Education. The projects must occur sometime during the summer, fall or spring academic semesters of 1997-98. Given the tight time line for application, it was agreed that the RFP would be distributed via e-mail.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Non-Discrimination Policy: In light of a forthcoming revision of the proposed policy, it was suggested that discussion be delayed until the new policy is available for examination. The Chair reiterated the need for Council advice to guide his participation in BOR deliberation and action on the policy, and announced his intent to forward, via e-mail, any documents he receives. Comments also can be sent to Donald Tynes at UMSA offices, with copies to the Chair.

B. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: Following an overview of the matter, the Chair noted that this is a discussion item, not an action agenda item, and that the intent is to provide input for further committee consideration.

1. Overview: Councilor McClive provided a status report on the progress of Administrative Affairs Committee discussions regarding non-tenure-track faculty, distributed copies of UMS-supplied data on the "Status of Instructional Faculty, UMS," and raised the question whether there is an issue needing further investigation. The committee is attempting first to clarify the relevant issues and concerns, and then to clarify definitions of this group of faculty.

There are published data showing a national trend to rely increasingly on non-tenure track faculty. The UMS data on change in headcount of "Instructional Faculty" from 1991 to 1995, shows a 5.78% increase in tenured/tenure-track faculty, and a 15.45% increase in fulltime non-tenure-track positions. However, it also was noted that the UMS data is based on small numbers for many institutions, and that a large proportion of the change is attributable to growth at two campuses -- UMAB and UMCP.

It was noted that there is both anecdotal and published data to suggest that, for those whose primary load is in teaching, some of the central concerns are consistency and/or lack of representation, definition of expectations in non-teaching components of the evaluation system, inclusion in the evaluation system in order to be considered for merit increases, and involvement in departmental affairs.

2. Council Discussion: Council reactions included the following, among others:

- It was suggested there is bias in the UMS data, due to ambiguity of definition and allowed discretion for person reporting the data to UMS.
- It was suggested that, in light of the broader issues of representation and shared governance, the study should include research faculty.
- Given the impression that there was a major increase in part time faculty, data needs to be gathered on that dimension of the issue. In a similar vein, it was noted that at SSU, over 35% of the courses are taught by non-tenure-track faculty, and that such information is valuable for students considering enrollment.
- There was considerable discussion of whether the data suggest that tenure-track positions are being replaced by non-tenure-track positions.
- It was suggested that, if a campus has a limited number of tenure track positions, part time faculty may be the only available option to meet student demand.
- Several councilors suggested the need to decide whether the committee concern was determining who is teaching the students, or the shape and composition of the faculty, or representation of non-tenure-track faculty.
- It was suggested that, to be useful, more data needs to be provided. For example, there needs to be a context of enrollment figures and data on tenure-track/non-tenure-track ratios in different departments.
- It was suggested that the current direction of the committee study ought to be abandoned in favor of a return to the effort to obtain due process protection for non-tenure-track faculty in the event of nonrenewal.
- It was suggested that, in light of wide institutional variations, unless a campus brings a specific issue to CUSF for consideration, CUSF should not become involved in the matter.
- It was noted that increasing reliance on part time faculty raises a number of questions which CUSF has a responsibility to address, including quality of instruction and increased workload for tenure-track faculty.
- In a climate of changing definitions of faculty, it was suggested that CUSF has an obligation to continue investigation of the issues, and, if necessary, revise the CUSF by laws to provide representation.

3. Summary: The following was provided as a summary of committee options:

- (a) Retain the current CUSF definition of faculty, and intervene to assure consistency of treatment of non-tenure-track faculty.
- (b) Recognize the need for campus flexibility in meeting competition, and balance that with a focus on means of assuring quality instruction.
- (c) Focus on the question of due process.

It was also noted that considerably more data is needed, regardless of the ultimate direction of the committee study.

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair urged the councilors to come prepared with topics to discuss with the Chancellor at the May CUSF meeting in Salisbury. The Chair also reminded the councilors to submit the names and addresses of the people to receive copies of letters of appreciation for service to CUSF this year.

IX. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 1:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael J. Wallinger

COUNCIL OF UNIVERSITY SYSTEM FACULTY MINUTES October 14, 1997 (DRAFT)

Members Present: Dr. Alcott Arthur, Dr. Ira Block, Dr John Collins, Dr. Thomas Erskine, Dr. Arthur Johnson, Dr. Lawrence Lasher, Dr. Marci McClive, Dr. Thaddeaus L. Phillips, Dr. Lance Revenaugh, Dr. Martha Siegel, Dr. Charles Stemheim, Dr. Lucille B. Strain, Dr. Nancy Struna, Dr. Richard Swaim,

Members Excused: Booth, Chapin, Davis, Georgiou, Gill, Glibert, Havas, Lomonaco, Luchsinger, Rebach, Vietri, Struna,

Alternates Present: Dr. Raouf Boules, Prof Vincent Brannigan, Dr Joyce Little

Guests Present: Dr. Helen Giles-Gee

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

Dr. McClive introduced Dr Catherine R. Gira, President of Frostburg State University, who welcomed the Council and shared her thoughts on technology, distance education and public policy issues regarding baccalaureate programs over the internet.

Minutes of the meeting of September 15, 1997 were approved as submitted.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Dr Lasher informed the Council that the Department Chair's Workshop would take place on October, 31 at the UMCP. The main topic will be "Enhancing Communication".

On October, 17 the semiannual meeting of the CUSF Executive Committee and the Institutional Senate/Assembly/Forum Chairs will take place at UMBC. Chancellor Langenberg and Regent Finan are scheduled to attend.

The Future of High School Education

The Chair invited Dr Siegel to discuss the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) meeting on 'The Future of High School Education'. The sponsors of the meeting were the State Department of Education (K-16 initiative), Maryland Higher Education Commission, and the University System of Maryland.

Dr Siegel reported that the plenary speakers focused on technology and that there were few participants from higher education or from the high-school classroom. She also noted a seeming disconnect between the plenary speakers and the people in the workgroups.

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

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

Early Retirement Legislation

At this time, there is not expected to be any legislation providing for early retirement for faculty, although there is expected to be legislation for members of the Employee's Pension/Retirement Systems. The USM has been encouraged to develop an internal "buyout plan" for faculty under current personnel regulations and laws.

The System task force on "buyouts" will have faculty representatives. We have been asked to provide four nominees, two from Research Institutions and two from Comprehensive Institutions, one of which is from an Historically Black Institution, for the System Committee. Two of the four nominees will be selected. The Chair urged the members to nominate persons from their Institutions to serve on the task force.

The Executive Committee has acquiesced in the System plan, but still wishes to continue to pursue a legislative arrangement. The Chair of the Legislative Affairs Committee has been charged to speak to appropriate persons in Annapolis about what can be done for Faculty.

Strategic Planning Group

The Council has been requested to send representatives to the four AAAC Committees developing the System Strategic Plan (Vision IV). These Committees are:

- Faculty Affairs
- K-16 Initiative
- Academic Programs

Minority Advancement

The Executive Committee suggests that we choose representatives to the AAAC committees from among the members of our own standing committees that have similar foci. Dr Giles-Gee noted that these committees are more than just strategic planning. They will also address all issues brought by institutions and faculty that are within their purview. The Chair noted that these committees will comprise regents, provosts, faculty staff and students, and will be a very important vehicle for communication.

Symposium on Distance Education

The Board of Regents has received and accepted the report of the Symposium. At the direction of the BOR, System is creating a task force to address the major issues raised in the report and to implement the recommendations. System has requested CUSF participation in developing policy on distance education.

The Chair requested Councillors to submit nominees from their institutions to serve on this task force.

UMUC Representation

The Chair distributed copies of the letter to Dr Massey, President of UMUC, that had been authorized by Council at the last meeting. In it, he requests Dr Massey to have the regular full-time faculty (those whose major duties are teaching, research and service) elect a person to attend meetings of CUSF and act as liaison between CUSF and the UMUC faculty.

Tuition Increases

The BOR have amended their tuition policy for next year. There will be a maximum increase of 4%. The USM will ask Governor Glendenning to make up shortfall by additional budget requests. Dr Brannigan, UMCP, frankly expressed apprehension that there did not seem to be a long-term financial plan for the USM. Dr Giles-Gee noted that there was a 4-yr plan, accepted by the Governor last year, that would provide for system financing, but that did not mean that the General Assembly would keep to our plan. Dr Brannigan expressed further concern that USM was being short-changed.

Further discussion by Council members showed grave distress about how the USM could be a federation of quality institutions without a stable financing base.

The Chair suggested that interested persons prepare a proposal for New Business.

Miscellany

The Chair has invited Regents to attend our meetings, but has not yet had a response.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Administrative Affairs

Dr McClive reported to Council on her presentation to MHEC on the Maryland State Plan for Post-Secondary Education at Frostburg on Oct 8, 1-997. She noted that Council had responded to a first draft of the plan last year, and that her current presentation was the result of reiterations following review by many members of the Council who had been kind enough to help her prepare it. Dr McClive distributed copies of her testimony.

She noted that the main themes were: that we urged greater and continuing faculty involvement in the development of the Plan, our concerns that there be appropriate means of monitoring the quality of academic programs, and that remedial education should not be solely the concern of the two-year institutions. The Chair commended Dr McClive for her hard work on keeping Council ahead of the curve.

The MHEC expects to begin incorporating suggestions on the Plan by the end of October. Council authorized the Administrative Affairs and the Executive Committee to prepare a formal response from Council to MHEC.

Educational Policy

Dr Siegel, Committee Convener, informed CUSF that she was on the working group for teacher education and professional development of the K-16 program. She noted that it was a very complex undertaking and requested that Dr Giles-Gee bring the Council up to date on the various facets.

Dr Giles-Gee noted that there are three concurrent initiatives. There is a System-wide review of the teacher education programs. There is a professional development report in the making for in-service training. There is also a pre-service plan for undergraduates. The last two are centered on the high school assessments that are currently underway.

Professional development - MSDE has asked USM to work with them to create the in-service continuing education for the State's teachers so that they will be ready for the new standards that will be in 2004. MSDE sees a need for improving content of courses, as well as defining curricula, particularly in math, the sciences, social studies and English. Education colleges in USM are responding to these needs. It is expected that the cooperation will spread into other colleges, e.g, Social Sciences to help improve course content.

MSDE is hoping to create "model schools" for improved in-service, professional. development, and is requesting additional moneys from the State jointly with higher education.

Council members asked many questions regarding the funding for the professional development programs and what impacts funding shifts might have on their institutions? Dr Giles-Gee noted that there were many forms of aid outside of the State budget.

In response to a question as to whether the high-school assessment examinations might be used as entrance standards for post-secondary education, Dr Giles-Gee noted that one of the goals for K-16 is a single assessment system which would incorporate both admissions and placement.

Dr Giles-Gee also discussed the Two-plus-Two programs. Council members noted that a large fraction of students entering 4-year schools are transfers, not traditional students. She noted that we are vulnerable to many institutions outside the State that are way ahead of us in course and program delivery.

Various members asked questions regarding quality control. Concerns were expressed about accreditation, and whether future degrees would have the same value as those today. It was also noted that outside organizations could skim State resources by using facilities at local institutions that were provided by the State. Many members expressed concern over the quality of faculty and constraints of budget that are hampering the quality of education. It was also asked how we could set up better communication with the 2-year schools to meet their needs?

Dr Giles-Gee felt that it would be very useful to bring these questions to the strategic planning work groups. Dr Giles-Gee then noted that she had covered the material in her report.

OLD BUSINESS: NONE

NEW BUSINESS:

Regent's Faculty Award

On behalf of the Faculty Development Committee, Dr Sternheim presented proposals to revise the guidelines for the Regent's Faculty Award. The sense of the Committee's proposals was accepted by the Council, but certain changes in language were made. Substantive changes were:

Item B.4 will now read ... Documentation of teaching activities (classroom and non-classroom), scholarship/research/creative activities and service activities that demonstrate that the nominee has fulfilled the obligations of the institutions workload policy.

Item C will now read ... Members should excuse themselves from the review of any nominee if there is the appearance of a conflict of interest.

The amended proposals were passed unanimously.

Multi-year funding

Motion from Dr Brannigan: (Block seconder)

CUSF wishes to express its concern over the inability of the State Government and the Board of Regents to agree on a consistent multi-year funding plan for the University System of Maryland.

The level of funding (both tuition and State) defines the quality of educational institutions that the

citizens of Maryland will enjoy. In addition, erratic shifts in funding are deleterious regardless of the absolute level of support.

Motion to refer to Executive Committee approved.

OTHER:

Request from Administrative Affairs Committee for members to review the proposed written submission from CUSF to MHEC.

Chair informed Council of the committee assignments, and invited committees to meet, should they wish to do so.

Dr Siegel introduced new member and new alternate from Towson University.

(DRAFT) Minutes

CUSF

March 17, 1998

Present: James Alexander (UMCP), Vincent Brannigan(UMCP alternate), Bill Chapin (UMES), John Collins (UMBI), Chris David (UMCP), Thomas Erskine(SSU), George C. Georgiou (TU), Larry Goldman (UMAB), Steve Havas (UMB), Larry Lasher(UMBC), Joyce Currie Little (TU), Samuel Lomonaco (UMBC), Vincent Luchsinger (UB), George Marx (USMH), Marci McClive (rSU), Richard McKentic (SSU), John N. Organ, Jr. (BSU), Joseph Proulx (UM,B), Steve Rebach (UMES), Lance Ravenaugh (FSU), Michael Seelig (USMH) Martha Siegel (TU), Carl Smith (UMCP), Charles E. Sternheim (UMCP), L. Strain (BSU), Richard Swaim (UB), Francille Wilson (UMCP), Dave Wright (UMCES)

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. H. M. Turner, UB, brought brief greetings from the campus, after which the minutes of the previous meeting were approved as distributed.

J. Alexander announced the nominations proposed by the Nominations Committed: Larry Lasher and Bill Chapin for Chair; Martha Siegel for ViceChair; Tom Erskine for Secretary; Nancy Struna, Larry Goldman and John Collins for the at-large positions. The election will take place at the April CUST meeting.

J. Alexander also reported on the MHEC Educational Policy meeting. The University of Phoenix application was approved (with an agreement on full-time faculty for each site/program, a more limited set of programs than previously anticipated, and a strong training program for new faculty). The new description of distance education courses counting toward degrees does not require any

contact with a professor in a classroom. Most important was the general issue of distance education, scheduled for our discussion later.

J. Alexander reported on the fast-track status of the new drug and alcohol policy for faculty. Concerns over this policy included its relationship to off-campus activities of the faculty and the problem of the regulation of private behaviour, the interpretation of the special rules for faculty in sensitive positions, concern over the lack of consultation with the campuses, etc. Vince Branigan made the following motion:

"The CUSF does not believe the Faculty Policy on Conduct, Discipline, Assistance, and Education for Abuse of Drugs and Alcoholw can be adopted without input from the various campuses. Therefore, the policy should not be adopted until such consultation has taken place."

The motion passed. We also agreed that it would be wise for us to invite an expert in this field to come to a CUSF meeting for further discussion.

Chancellor Langenberg led a discussion of the USM Pathways to Lifelong Learning document, placing it in the historical perspective of the (other) Visions documents. The document was put together under the leadership of George Marx with campus input from the chief academic officers (reportedly selected in lieu of more grass-roots input in view of the urgency of early completion of this work). While the chancellor emphasized the flexibility that the document would provide, CUSF members expressed concern about the possible erosion of tenure, the difficulties arising from the use of large numbers of part-time faculty (quality control, getting departmental tasks done without adding more burdens to the load of the tenured faculty, etc.), the difficulties arising in attracting strong faculty to institutions following the "Pathways" vision, the apparent change to a model more like the University of Phoenix in response to administratively perceived demands from external constituencies, problems with adjusting the evaluation and rewards structure for faculty to match new realities, etc. Chancellor Langenberg emphasized the lack of well-researched evidence on the difference between instruction presented by part- and full-time faculty, the necessity to move forward in response to the realities of the political and educational situation in which we find ourselves, that the document focusses on the instructional mission of the system (and not on research and service), and that we need to move forward in our areas of strength. George Marx agreed that there needs to be a more positive statement about tenure, that input providing more felicitous wording was welcome, and that the document needs to indicate more clearly that much of what is being proposed is already going on in

many departments on many campuses.

Discussion in the afternoon of the 'Pathways' document continued in a similar vein with additional concerns expressed that the method of creation of the document seemingly violated current shared governance principles. Succinct comments and expressions from the various campuses are to be sent to Larry Lasher for the construction of an appropriate response from CUSF.

In the absence of old business and new business, the final activity of the day was the report of chair, the executive committee and the other committees. The Board of Regents Faculty Awards will be presented at the April 13 meeting at SSU. The BOR Education policy committee has received the K16 report and has requested timely implementation. There is some interest in and possibility of CUSF/CUSS cooperation on faculty development. Martha Siegel reported that the Maryland Teacher Education Task Force is moving ahead and requested that commentary on the distributed document on remedial work be forwarded to her. It was moved that

"CUSF accept the draft CUSF response to the Report of the USM Teacher Education Task Force, and direct the CUSF Educational Policy committee to continue dialog and negotiation with the USM Teacher Education Task Force during the implementation of the policy and to report back periodically to CUSF"

The motion passed.

Marci McClive reminded us that she still needs campus responses on the reality of the implementation of the various campus shared governance documents and that the bylaws change to have a "chair elect" will come up for a vote at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned after a reading of the list of awardees of the BOR faculty awards.

BILL CHAPIN

**COUNCIL OF UNIVERSITY SYSTEM FACULTY
MINUTES (DRAFT)
May 21, 1998**

Present: Tom Erskine (SSU), Rich McKenzie (SSU), Lucille Strain (BSU), Pat Gilbert (CES), Richard Swain ((UB), Joseph Proulx (UM,B), Nancy Struna (UMCP), Carl Smith (UMCP), Larry Goldman (UM,B), Martha Siegel (TU), Helen Giles-Gee (USMH), Bill Chapin (UMES), Lance Ravenaugh (FSU), Art Johnson (UMBC), Joyce Little (TU), James Alexander (UMCP), Steve Rebach (UMES), Larry Lasher (UMBC), John Collins (UMBI), and Alcott Arthur (CSU).

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 am. Pat Gilbert welcomed CUSF and introduced Dr. Wayne Bell of the Center for Environmental Sciences, who expressed his

appreciation for the work of Helen Giles-Gee, acquainted the group with the background of the Horn Point facility and the achievements of the program, indicated his concern about a missing "research" component in the Pathways document, and concluded his remarks with a discussion of the striper/bluefish situation on the Choptank.

The minutes of the April 15, 1998, meeting were approved as distributed.

Chair Larry Lasher's report began with his (and the CUSF's) appreciation for Helen Giles-Gee's long and meritorious service to CUSF. She, in turn, thanked the group for gifts and informed the council that George Marx was retiring around the beginning of 1999. She went on to discuss the recent Educational Policy meeting of the Board of Regents, which was largely concerned with the revised Pathways document and the CUSF response, which helped shape the revision. The CUSF concern with substantive and procedural problems was acknowledged, and the Chancellor indicated that the CUSF would play a significant role in shaping Propositions 5 and 6. Helen Giles-Gee spoke about CUSF involvement in these areas through committee representation, and members of the council asked questions about the composition of the committee and about additional concerns involving Proposition 3. The Executive Committee will meet with George Marx to work out procedures for revisions to the Pathways document. Council members noted the importance of staying on top of this issue, given the time constraints, and a motion was passed that the Executive Committee report plans for the process to the CUSF at the Coppin meeting. Information item: the Educational Policy Committee received the report on advising within the USM. The Board of Regents accepted a set of changes in the APT document for the medical school at UM, B. There was some discussion about the precedent involved and the possibility of similar changes being made at other units in the System. Discussion returned to the Pathways document: at a Chancellor's Council meeting, Pathways met with varied reaction from the presidents, and the "middle way" seems to have won; the Provosts will look again at the most recent Pathways draft at their June meeting.

The final version of the retirement policy was discussed: faculty need 25 years of service and need be 60 years old in order to be eligible to elect retirement during the June 1-August 31 "window"; \$30,000 (in 3 \$10,000 payments within the calendar year) will be the "payoff" for retiring; presidents do have some latitude in determining when a faculty member's retirement will take effect--September, 1998, or January or June, 1999.

The Faculty Development Program involving Collaborative Programs was discussed, and it was announced that none of the \$10,000 was awarded. Council members expressed the need to review the guidelines in an effort to get more applications. The Executive Committee is to look at the guidelines and report back to the Council.

Council members were asked to send Tom Erskine the roster of 1998-1999 senators from their schools and also to indicate when they might be willing to host the CUSF (they were asked to list some alternative dates).

The governance situation at Bowie was reviewed, and Chair Lasher reported being in touch

with Dr. Sidney Walker at Bowie--the Executive Committee will continue to monitor the situation there.

Jay Alexander reported on the work of the Faculty Advisory Council to MHEC. He noted that the FAC has made some significant progress in dealing with distance education issues, observed that there were more community college people than USM people involved in committee attendance and work, and expressed his optimism about the role of the FAC. The Executive Committee was urged to study the matter.

Chair Lasher urged councilmembers to attend the June 19th meeting at Coppin and issued a special invitation to all new (1998-1999) members to attend. Martha Siegel and Larry Lasher reported on the K-16 Teacher Training Conference. The Developmental/Remedial Education report was not totally approved; standards for English Composition were approved, but the evaluation process for English was not approved. Three key issues were identified: articulation, the need for involvement of arts and sciences faculty in teacher education programs, and the available funding for small projects involving collaboration between secondary schools and higher education.

After lunch the discussion turned to the Drug and Alcohol Abuse Policy. Many concerns were expressed, and Helen Giles-Gee outlined legislation that impacted Maryland's policy. As a result of the discussion, the Council passed a much-amended motion to appoint an ad hoc committee to review the document and suggest changes in wording for action at the June meeting of CUSF. The motion stated that in their deliberations the committee consider, at a minimum, the following matters: the response of the department chair, the consistency of language in definition ("sensitive," for example), self-reporting, substance testing, a distinction between off and on campus activities. It is understood that the committee can contact the Attorney General's Office for input. The committee is to consist of Johnson and Goldman, with others to be named.

The Administrative Affairs Committee will issue an interim report on shared governance and a chairperson's workshop--this is to be distributed with the minutes of the May meeting.

A motion that the Executive Committee draft a letter to the Board of Regents calling attention to the fact that salaries, despite the recent "five and dime" raises, have actually fallen in terms of the Board's expressed intent to have salaries reach the 85th percentile.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted, Tom Erskine

MINUTES
CUSF Meeting at Coppin State College
June 19, 1998

In attendance: Tom Erskine (SSU), Raouf Boules (TU), Steve Rebach (UMES), Larry Goldman

(UMAB), George Marx (USMH), Joseph Proulx (UMAB), Vince Luchsinger (UB), Steve Havas (UM,B), Marci McClive (FSU), Dave Nicol (FSU), Steve Boyan (UMBC), Rose Jagus (UMBI), Charles Sternheim (UMCP), James Alexander (UMCP), Nancy Struna (UMCP), Alcott Arthur (Coppin), George Georgiou (TU), Bill Chapin (UMES), Sam Lomonoco (UMBC), Joyce Curry Little (TU), T.J. Bryan (USMH).

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 am. Alcott introduced President Cal Burnett of Coppin, who welcomed CUSF to the campus. Incoming CUSF members Steve Boyan (UMBC) and Dave Nichol (FSU) were introduced.

Chair Lasher reported that Martha Siegel had resigned from the CUSF Executive Committee due to some health problems. At their June 29th meeting the Executive Committee will discuss a possible replacement--the Chair asked that interested parties notify him. He also requested that the campuses let Tom Erskine know who the senate chairs are. The minutes of the May meeting of CUSF were approved.

Chair Lasher then discussed the raison d'etre of CUSF and suggested that a different body, perhaps one comprised of senate chairs, might be more effective and closer to the campuses. CUSF's mission and identity were also questioned, and a general discussion, which included George Marx's appreciative comments about CUSF achievements, followed. At its June meeting the Executive Committee is to continue the discussion.

Chair Lasher also announced that in mid April letters went out to the recipients of the Regents' Awards.

Jay Alexander, our CUSF representative to MHEC/FAC and its president, distributed a list of FAC activities during 1997-1998 and a report concerning states's support of higher education, a field (including faculty salaries, high tuition, low funding of financial aid) Maryland rates low in. He also noted that there will be a revision of campus mission statements and urged faculty involvement in this process. FAC meetings are held the 3rd Tuesday of each month, September through June.

George Marx introduced Dr. T. J. Bryan, who will be working with CUSF during the 1998-1999 academic year. He went on to comment on increased funding for technology (80% for campuses, 20% for infrastructure connections), the upcoming meeting of the Regents' Educational Policy Committee, where there will be discussion of Propositions 5, 6, and 8, contemplated changes in faculty workload (contact vs. credit hours, released time for UG/GRAD independent study), a good financial outlook for next year's budget, the report of the task force study of the structure of Maryland higher education (due January 1, 1999), and MHEC tactics for the implementation of the state's higher education plan.

Marcie McClive then reported on Shared Governance. The intent of her committee's study was to determine if there was a discrepancy between the presidents' answers about shared governance and the "reality" of the situation at the schools. CUSF members were asked to report on how

accurate they thought senate presidents' responses to shared governance questions were. For the most part, CUSF members' responses corroborated senate presidents' responses. CUSF believes that shared governance is a matter that the Chancellor needs to understand is a real issue. A motion was passed to have Chair Lasher and the Executive Committee meet with the Chancellor to discuss CUSF concerns about shared governance, particularly at the dean and chair level.

The Executive Committee was charged to get a small working group together to discuss Pathways over the summer.

Thomas Erskine, 03:59 PM 7/5/98 -, change of meeting date? -Reply

Larry Goldman presented proposed changes and recommendations for the proposed Drug and Alcohol Abuse policy. There were concerns about the vagueness regarding violations and sanctions and the wording involving substance testing: "may not be" tested accept as required by state and federal law. CUSF wants a policy that it can support. To that end a motion was passed to adopt the committee's report as a critique of the proposed policy and ask that the drafters' new version take CUSF concerns (outlined above) into account and that CUSF see the new draft in order to discuss it.

Touching farewells concluded the meeting at 2:30 pm. Respectfully submitted, Tom Erskine,
Secretary