

CUSF General Body Meeting
Bowie State University
at Bowie, Maryland

Minutes

Wednesday, February 15, 2012

Attendance:	
Bowie (2)	Joan S. Langdon, Monika Gross
Coppin (2)	Virletta Bryant
Frostburg (3)	Robert B. Kauffman; Peter Herzfield, Elesha Ruminski
Salisbury (3)	David Parker, Bobbi Adams, E. Patrick McDermott
Towson (4)	Jay Zimmerman
UB (2)	Stephanie Gibson, John Callahan
UMB (5)	John Collins
UMBC (3)	Nigaraj Neerchal, Zane Berge, Drew Alfgren
UMCES (2)	Raleigh Hood
UMCP (6)	Stephen Mount, Alan Mattlage, Radu Balan, Kenneth Holum, William Montgomery,
UMES (2)	Bill Chapin, Emmanuel Onyeozili
UMUC (3)	Betty Jo Mayeske, Margaret Cohen, Richard Schumaker
Guests:	John Wolf (USM-guest), Tim Sullivan (TU-guest), Debra Stanley (UB-guest)

Future Meeting Dates:

March 16, 2112 (Friday)	CSU, Baltimore
April 16, 2112 (Monday)	UMB, Baltimore
May 18, 2112 (Friday)	TU, Towson
June 14, 2112 (Thursday)	SU, Salisbury

CONVENING THE MEETING - 10:00 AM

Jay Zimmerman, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM in the Library at Bowie State University. Joyce Shirazi, Chair, was attending a meeting regarding the search for Irv's replacement that conflicted with this meeting. [Secretary's Note: *There was no phone service available for members to call into the meeting.*]

WELCOME FROM BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY - 10:03 AM

Joan Langdon introduced the President of Bowie State University, Dr. Mickey Burnim. One of the thrusts of Dr. Burnim's introduction was "access." He noted that he had recently attended the Association of State College Universities (ASCU). Bowie State University is servicing many first generation college students. The mission of ASCU is to provide access to the common ordinary students. Many of these students are not elite. He emphasized the role of universities like Bowie in providing access to a new generation of students in need. Second he introduced the group to the new Performing Arts Center, its

technological features, and its potential contribution to Bowie State University and to its students. Regarding its technological innovations, he noted that the construction emphasizes sound reduction techniques. For example, they place putty around the electrical outlets to prevent sound from migrating between rooms.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES - 10:16 AM

It was moved and seconded to approve the January 20, 2012 minutes. The motion was passed and the minutes were approved.

SENIOR VICE CHANCELLOR'S REPORT - 10:20 AM

Since Irv Goldstein was not in attendance, John Wolfe, Associate Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, gave the report. He provided an update on Irv's status and noted that Irv was planning to attend the BOR meeting on Friday (2/17/12).

Legislative Update: Since everything was pending, there was not much to report on the legislative update. All of the bills mentioned below are pending at this point in the process.

SB-239 addresses technology transfer or commercialization for Maryland's public and private institutions. This bill would provide funding for the policy recently adopted by the BOR. [Secretary's Note: *See the January 20 minutes for a discussion of this item.*]

SB-633 focuses on an amendment to the child abuse law pursuant to the recently passed BOR child abuse policy. It would allow the presidents of USM institutions and the Chancellor to take appropriate action after the discovery of child abuse at an institution.

SB-859 and SB-972 focus on collective bargaining for graduate assistants, adjuncts faculty, and tenured faculty. These bills are a followup to the 2011 study conducted last year. [Secretary's Note: *Since this was discussed by the University Presidents in closed session there is no summary to be provided.*]

BOR Friday: From an academic affairs perspective, John covered several agenda items at the upcoming BOR meeting on Friday, February 17, 2012. These included the following items: 1) the Regent Awards will be awarded at the meeting, 2) new programs were reviewed for approval including a new doctorate program at Frostburg, 3) 88 program reviews were conducted, 4) there were still some issues with Shady Grove, 5) the Strategic Alliance initiative is moving forward into an implementation stage, and 6) the Coalition Lawsuit completed the bench trial portion with the judge only into a 30 day post trial phase. In response to a question, John noted that all capital issues in the coalition lawsuit were decided in favor of the State. Second, he didn't expect resolution before September 2012 of this year. Regardless, it is likely to continue on appeal. Third, he indicated that the lawsuit has focused on the capital side, but not on the programmatic side.

College Completion Goal: The goal is to have a 55% completion rate of AA and BS degrees by 2025. Currently we are at 44% or roughly 39,000 degrees in 2010. This interprets as 58,000 degrees must be awarded annually in 2025. Two questions were raised from the floor on this issue. First, in order to meet this goal, there may be a tendency water down our education in order to meet the goal. Second, if we are going to graduate more students, we will need more resources at the front end to do this. John acknowledged both points were good points.

Cultural Diversity: SB-438 is a bill that requires annual reports on cultural diversity. It requires a plan, a program, and initiative that will provide training and instruction to faculty on diversifying faculty, staff, and students. Reports are required from the institutions to MHEC and to BOR. The reports from the institutions to MHEC are due by September.

Finally, System in conjunction with CUSF is sponsoring the Department Chairs workshop at System on Friday, April 27th.

As part of the discussion, Jay noted to the group of the upcoming Senate Chairs meeting on Friday, April 6th at System in Adelphi.

PANEL DISCUSSION - Lasting Legacy of Shared Governance Panel - 10:56 AM

Jay introduced the panel members and Steve Mount, moderator of the session. The panel members included Tim Sullivan, TU Professor and University Senate Chair, Debra Stanley, UB Professor and Shared Governance Work Group Chair, and John Wolfe, USM Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Tim Sullivan began the panel discussion. He discussed shared governance at Towson University. He noted that Towson has grown dramatically, and that there is a large cadre of faculty who came on board in the 1960s and 1970s who are about to retire. This will result in a potentially large turnover in the near future in faculty as the baby-boomers begin to retire. This will dramatically affect the role of new faculty in shared governance. His observation was that the younger faculty may be tending to wait for something to happen rather than being proactive within the shared governance process. He concluded with the point that we are at a potentially turning point with younger faculty needing to step up and taking their role in shared governance. Also, it is incumbent on those in shared governance to create an environment to integrate the younger faculty into shared governance.

Debra Stanley discussed the recent evolution of shared governance on the University of Baltimore campus. Some of the points that she made are as follows. First, there is a need to reduce redundancy in the current shared governance model to allow for a more unified campus-wide governance process. She noted that there are four colleges at UB with everyone actively participating in shared governance at the individual college level. She stated that because faculty participate at the college level, shared governance has not been as strong as it should be at the university level, and issues are often not dealt with as an entire community. She noted that each college/school treats shared governance somewhat differently. For example the Law School treats it like a faculty council, while the other three colleges have separate senates. Second, she stated that there has been concern over the lack of transparency among administration. Third, she addressed culture and how communications have changed in the last twenty years. She noted that some of the problems with UB's ineffective shared governance process have resulted in recent news reports, the details of which she wasn't going to discuss at this time. Recent acknowledgment of the problems with the shared governance process led to the formation of a Shared Governance Workgroup. The primary purpose of the workgroup was to identify effective models of governance to guide the restructuring of UB's shared governance model. The workgroup spent time gathering information from a number of campuses around the country that have a strong shared governance model, visiting campuses and interviewing campus governance leaders at various USM and other universities in the surrounding region. Several effective models of shared governance were used to develop a new UB shared governance structure that is in the final stages of development. She discussed three primary elements of effective shared governance – communications, transparency, and accountability.

She noted the September article in *University Business* titled: ***Whatever Happened to Shared Governance*** and its effect on their process. There is a greater expectation for faculty to change in terms of shared governance. [Secretary's Note: *The website is provided below and the article is provided as an attachment.*] Roles have changed as have issues and concerns. Autonomy and increased workloads have influenced shared governance involvement and this may have resulted in increased apathy. Fourth, as a commuter campus, she expressed concern that they may not have a sense of community that is often found at residential campuses.

<http://www.universitybusiness.com/article/what-ever-happened-shared-governance-0>

John Wolfe focused on maintaining the legacy of shared governance in a period of change. First, with Irv's retirement, he noted that we have entered a period of transition. Second, he challenged the group that it was their responsibility through CUSF to protect and insure the future of shared governance in this time of transition. In addition, he noted through CUSF, faculty have the vehicle to protect the legacy of shared governance in Maryland.

LUNCH - 12:00 PM

MOTION #1205: A motion was made from the floor to reaffirm the constitutional amendment passed at the previous meeting (MOTION #1203) to eliminate the University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute (UMBI) from the bylaws. The discussion indicated that the group was not sure whether the bylaws required the passing of a constitutional amendment at a second meeting. If this were the case, the passage of this motion would fulfill that requirement. [Disposition: passed unanimously].

MOTION #1206: The proposal on academic freedom (see attachment) was moved and seconded. In the discussion phase there were two friendly amendments made and accepted. After discussion, it was concluded that the motion needed additional work on it before it could pass. The motion was withdrawn and will be resubmitted next month. [Disposition: motion was withdrawn]

MOTION #1207: A motion from the Executive Committee to change the CUSF bylaws regarding phone attendance was seconded. The proposed changes are noted below. During discussion two major points were made. First, it was noted that if it were the desire to *kill attendance at meetings*, this proposal would accomplish this objective. It was suggested that this motion would result in CUSF never meeting again as an actual body. Second, there was a question regarding physical representation of constituent institutions versus members. Third, a suggestion was made that phone voting might be allowed for general motions but disallowed for bylaw changes and for elections. A motion was made to table the main motion. It passed. [Disposition: table main motion passed; 22 yea, 4 no]

Article III Meetings

3.4.c. A quorum for meetings shall be defined as at least fifteen Council members and a majority of the Constituent Institutions *physically* represented.

3.4.d. *Members participating remotely by audio are considered to be in attendance for the purpose of voting if all members can hear one another simultaneously and the secretary is aware of their attendance, although members participating remotely are not assured secrecy on secret ballots. This provision takes precedence over Robert's Rules of Order.*

Faculty Affairs Committee: The committee has been active. They are looking at tuition remission, retention, and the transfer of tenure along with other issues.

Nomination Committee: Since Steve Mount is not running for Executive Committee again, he volunteered to chair the nomination committee. Volunteers were solicited. Betty Jo Mayeske volunteered to serve on the committee. Other CUSF members can contact Steve regarding their involvement.

Legislature Affairs Committee: John Calhoun noted that the committee is looking at two issues. First, it is looking at the issue of “*indemnification*” with regards to the child abuse policy. They will report back to the General Body at the next meeting. Second, they are looking at the budget item regarding the \$750 bonus and the proposed corresponding decrease in budgets.

Rules Committee: Bill Chapin reported that there was no report at this time.

OLD BUSINESS

A question was asked of the Executive Committee whether they had received the report from the UMUC Provost. They had not.

A statement was made following up on the 55% goal, filling positions, the issue of imbalance between the faculty and administration, the growth of administration versus faculty, and the growth of enrollment should be reflected in the growth of faculty rather than the administration.

NEW BUSINESS

There was a question regarding retirees living overseas possibly not being eligible for medical treatment because of a policy decision made by the Office of Budget and Management. Jay indicated that we need to talk with faculty affairs and John Wolfe will look into it at System.

A statement was made regarding the revitalization of Coppin State. The main concern of the question focused on the fact that there was no faculty representation on the committee. John Wolfe responded that the original study was done in 2000. Representation on the committee was determined by the Legislature and not USM. A draft copy of the AAUP response to the report was entered into the record. [Secretary’s Note: *A copy of the draft response is attached to the minutes.*]

ADJOURNMENT - 1:53 PM

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:53 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert B. Kauffman

Robert B. Kauffman
Secretary

Attachments: Draft of USM Statement on Academic Freedom (Original Document)
What Ever Happened to Shared Governance?
Draft - AAUP Coppin Response to Report

Draft of USM statement on Academic Freedom

Academic freedom is the liberty that faculty members must have if they are to practice their scholarly profession in accordance with the norms of that profession. It is not a term or a condition of employment; rather, it is based in the institutional structure of this and other universities and is fundamental to their common mission of promoting inquiry and advancing the sum of human knowledge and understanding. Although some aspects of academic freedom are also protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, academic freedom exists, independent of any external protection, as a basic prerequisite for universities to fulfill their mission to our society.

Generally, academic freedom is the freedom to teach, both in and outside the classroom, to conduct research and other scholarly or creative activities, and to publish or otherwise disseminate the results. Academic freedom also encompasses the freedom to address any matter of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of any agency of institutional governance. Faculty have the freedom to address the larger community with regard to any social, political, economic, or other interest.

Academic freedom is most commonly exercised by individual faculty members, but remains first and foremost a professional prerequisite of faculty members as a group. Faculty must be free from any censorship, threat, restraint, retaliation, or discipline by the University with regard to the pursuit of truth in the performance of their teaching, research, publishing or service obligation.

Academic freedom includes the following specific freedoms:

- *freedom of research and publication.* Within the broad standards of accountability established by their profession and their individual disciplines, faculty members must enjoy the fullest possible freedom in their research and in circulating and publishing their results. This freedom follows immediately from the university's basic commitment to advancing knowledge and understanding. Restrictions on research and publication should be minimal and unobtrusive.
- *freedom of teaching.* This freedom is an outgrowth of the previous one. Faculty members must be able not only to disseminate to their students the results of research by themselves and others in their profession, but also to train students to think about these results for themselves, often in an atmosphere of controversy that, so long as it remains in a broad sense educationally relevant, actively assists students in mastering the subject and appreciating its significance.
- *freedom of internal criticism.* Universities promote the common good not through individual decision or bureaucratic calculation, but through broad-based engagement in the scholarly endeavor. Faculty members, because of their education and their institutional knowledge, play an indispensable role as independent participants in university decision making. By virtue of this role, they are entitled to comment on or criticize University policies or decisions, either individually or through institutions of faculty governance.
- *freedom of participation in public debate.* Both within and beyond their areas of expertise, faculty members are generally entitled to participate as citizens in public forums and debates without fear of institutional discipline or restraint, so long as it is clear that they are not acting or speaking for the University. Faculty are not institutional representatives unless specifically authorized as such.

Numerous positive outcomes flow from these freedoms. The historical model for education in the U.S. has been one shared governance where the faculty are major contributors to the operation of the institution. When faculty play a major role in ensuring quality of education the competitive advantage necessary for freedom of thought and creativity is assured. Faculty also spend much time and effort – implicitly and explicitly – advocating for effective use of taxpayer funding within the institution and system. They must be assured the ability to function in these roles without fear of retaliation for unpopular views.

Academic freedom is essential to the fulfillment of the purposes of the University. The parties acknowledge and encourage the continuation of an atmosphere of confidence and freedom while recognizing that the concept of academic freedom is accompanied by a corresponding concept of responsibility to the University and its students. It is of critical importance that any restrictions to academic freedom required – such as those delineated in a particular professional ethics statement or any university standards pertaining to disruptive behavior – be drawn up and implemented with substantial faculty input, in such a way as to minimize infringement of academic freedom. In large part, this goal should be accomplished by ensuring that institutional discipline of faculty members is in proportion to the severity and persistence of misconduct, and by insisting that alleged offenses be handled with appropriate standards of due process, including, wherever possible, the judgment of competent peers. For the rest, however, it must be recognized that contemporary threats to academic freedom are constantly evolving. This University — its faculty, administration, and students alike — must exercise constant vigilance in resisting such threats, whether they arise within the university or from outside

Posted: Mon, 08/29/2011 - 11:05am

What Ever Happened to Shared Governance?

Twenty-first century challenges are threatening a bastion of faculty power and pride.

By:

Ron Schachter

University Business, Sept 2011

The idea that faculty members are uniquely qualified to determine the direction, standards, and practices of the institutions at which they teach and do research has been a tenet in higher education. At many colleges and universities, the faculty has almost sole responsibility for hiring, promoting, and granting tenure to its own.

Formal faculty input can extend farther than that to such areas as new academic programs, expansion plans, and building uses, all part of the time-honored practice of "shared governance." That kind of involvement by professors has been seen by many as a natural extension of their academic mission, and it began on some American campuses as early as the 19th century, according to Cary Nelson, president of the American Association of University Professors.

Nelson is concerned, though, that meaningful shared governance is becoming an endangered species, so much so that he organized a three-day AAUP conference in Washington last fall to address the problem. "I think shared governance has been in crisis," Nelson explains.

That view would seem to be at odds with a study released last year by the Association of Governing Boards in Washington, D.C. A full 90 percent of the colleges and universities surveyed reported having a faculty governing body—usually a faculty senate entrusted with communicating ideas and concerns to the administration—and 59 percent of responding institutions described the faculty bodies as "policy influencing," even though institutions report that they are mainly advisory.

The newest chair at the table is government. In return for its loan guarantees and funding, the government will demand more results and efficiency.' —Matthew Woessner, co-author, *The Still Divided Academy: How Competing Visions of Power, Politics, and Diversity Complicate the Mission of Higher Education*

A number of schools around the country have in fact become known for effective shared governance practices, from the University of Cincinnati—in which the faculty is actively involved in collective bargaining, strategic planning, and infrastructure management—to American University (D.C.), which has made strides over the past decade to gain nonvoting representation on the school's board of trustees and to give term faculty more of a voice in the faculty senate and in university issues.

Last June, the AAUP, which presents an annual shared governance award, recognized Georgia Perimeter College and its president, Anthony Tricoli, for including faculty leaders as voting members of the president's cabinet and the president's policy advisory board. Georgia Perimeter faculty members also serve on ad hoc task teams to address short-term issues affecting the school.

But other recently published research suggests that faculty influence is not what it once was. In their book, *The Still Divided Academy: How Competing Visions of Power, Politics, and Diversity Complicate the Mission of Higher Education* (Roman & Littlefield Publishers, 2010), which surveyed more than 4,000 administrators, faculty, and students at four-year institutions—husband and wife Matthew and April Woessner write that only 17 percent of professors thought they had "a great deal of say" in college governance. (The number was considerably higher at schools granting only bachelors degrees—39

percent—than at doctoral-granting institutions—13 percent.) Another 47 percent acknowledged having "some say."

Their experience is echoed by faculty and administration leaders who admit that the landscape for shared governance has changed over the past 20 years, along with the backgrounds of university administrators, the role of non-faculty constituencies, and the impact of the troubled economy and new legislation.

A Turbulent 2011

The past year dealt some sharp blows to the working relationship of faculty members and their administrators. Controversial new laws passed in Wisconsin and Ohio greatly curtailed the collective bargaining rights of all public employees, including university professors, who marched in protest this past February and excoriated their respective presidents for endorsing the changes. (See "Discord in Wisconsin and Ohio").

The Idaho State Board of Education, meanwhile, resorted to what the AAUP's Nelson calls a "nuclear option" last February by suspending the Boise State University Faculty Senate at the request of ISU President Art Vailas. The senate had opposed his proposed changes to faculty governance, which would have put committees on curriculum, budget, research, and master planning under the direct control of the administration without faculty senate oversight.

ISU Communications Director Mark Levine says the state's action came in response to a stalemate between the two sides. "This is only one element," Levine explains, referring to the dispute over the changes in governance. "There's been a contentious relationship between certain faculty members and the administration and they could not work out an agreement to reconcile their differences."

Levine adds that an agreement between the two sides for a third-party facilitator fell through, and that Vailas has appointed a provisional faculty senate to develop a new shared governance agreement, along with a constitution and bylaws that Levine says were lacking in the past.

The events at Boise State bring to mind those four years earlier at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (N.Y.), where the precipitating issue was the faculty senate's insistence that non-tenure-track clinical faculty have voting rights. The subsequent standoff with the RPI president led to the suspension of the senate.

Earlier this year, AAUP investigators released a report charging that RPI violated the shared governance relationship with faculty and that the transitional body that has replaced the faculty senate for the past five years provides an inadequate substitute.

"Rensselaer continues to operate without an independent, self-determining body of faculty governance, and without such a body, neither the faculty nor the board has a constitutional mechanism for compromise," the report's authors argued.

The Changing Landscape

While the recent flashpoints have drawn the most attention and headlines, those involved with shared governance note that there's been more of a changing landscape on campus, starting with an influx of presidents and provosts who were not professors first and who are coming increasingly from the business world.

"There are more career administrators, many of whom have not taught a class or done research," observes the AAUP's Nelson. The Still Divided Academy points out that 74 percent of administrators who had come through the faculty ranks said they "usually" agreed with faculty viewpoints, while the number shrank to 57 percent for administrators without professorial experience.

Janet Dudley-Eshbach, president of Salisbury University (Md.), agrees that her experience as a professor earlier in her academic career has made a difference in how she practices shared governance. "The reality is that I still think like a faculty member. I understand the culture and that people do debate and lock horns, but can still leave the room and be friends," Dudley-Eshbach says. "It's different from a business model. I've seen a lot of university presidents who came out of business fall flat on their faces."

Faculty senates are also facing a new reality in that other stakeholders have become increasingly prominent in university life and decision-making. "Presidents have become more beholden to the administrative apparatus involved in fundraising," explains Matthew Woessner, who just finished a one-year term as president of the faculty senate at Penn State's Harrisburg campus, where he is an associate professor of political science and public policy.

Woessner adds that these days, constituencies from athletic departments to offices for student affairs—which he says have become involved in "an arms race in student amenities"—are becoming more influential when it comes to university policies.

"Rather than listen to the faculty and deans to set the course of the institution, presidents listen to the VP for advancement, the VP for student affairs, the athletic director, the head of the alumni association," Woessner says. "The primary losers in that shift of power have been faculty, deans, and department chairs."

Levine of Boise State seconds that assessment. "In the philosophy of our president, the faculty senate is an important part of the university but not the only entity."

"The sense of the faculty existing at the center of the institution has definitely eroded," concludes April Woessner, an associate professor and department chair of the political science department at Elizabethtown College (Pa.). She notes that, while the book demonstrating that demise that she co-authored with her husband is based on data collected in 1999 by Stanley Rothman, a professor emeritus at Smith College (Mass.), it described a trend that has continued.

"The newest chair at the table is government," adds Matthew Woessner, especially at public universities such as his. "In return for its loan guarantees and funding, the more government will demand more results and efficiency. And it will have a lot more influence on the testing [of students] that we will be doing."

And recent legislation barring faculty from collective bargaining is further evidence, says April Woessner, that lawmakers and even the general public are taking a diminished view of the role of professors. "Somebody outside of the university system does not understand the notion of shared governance," she says. "We're just employees."

It's the Economy

Financial pressures have also left their marks on shared governance practices, and not just during the economic crises of the past three years, Nelson says. "State funding of higher education has steadily declined over a 20-year period, so there's been more conflict over the budget." He points to Florida State University's large-scale downsizing of its anthropology department this past year and the State University of New York, Albany's elimination of multiple language programs. "There were no consultations with the

departments or with the faculty senate, so shared governance failed," Nelson insists.

"In the past five or 10 years, many campuses have seen deep, deep budget cuts that have eliminated faculty positions and entire departments," points out Salisbury's Dudley-Eshbach. "That makes the conversation very, very difficult."

What's also become more difficult, faculty senate veterans say, is sharing governance over areas such as whether to put up and how to design new academic buildings, how the budget is allocated, and what say the faculty have over new academic programs. And they offer up examples that they agree could be chapters in a textbook of how not to conduct shared governance.

Nelson, a professor of English at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, cites an initiative by its former chancellor to start a new program promoting capitalism, for which the board consisted mainly of pro-business, largely conservative members and just one UI professor. "They were going to appoint visiting faculty, fund course development, and award research grants to faculty agreeing with their ideology," he says. "It was an absolute breach of the faculty handbook, and when it became public, the whole thing fell apart."

Nelson recalls that UI faculty were similarly bypassed when administration launched an online learning site called Global Campus three years ago. "They didn't know about online education," he says, particularly that the UI students most likely to take online courses were those already enrolled in degree programs on campus.

UI administration, he continues, envisioned a degree earned entirely online. "It was a curriculum innovation, and that's officially a faculty responsibility. The Global Campus closed down, and \$25 million went down the drain. And it was because of the administration feeling that they knew best."

John Lachs, a Vanderbilt University (Tenn.) philosophy professor since 1967 and a former president of the school's faculty senate, has gone so far in his recent writings to declare shared governance a myth. "The myth is that faculty constitute the heart of the university and are in certain respects self-determining. We really imagine that we have an impact on how the university operates, what its procedures are, and what its aims are," he laments.

"As faculty senate president, you see more clearly that the senate can only recommend to the chancellor," he adds, "I have a lot of faith in the good will of administrators when they have good will, but it's clear that faculty and administrators are not on a par."

A bigger disconnect exists between the faculty senate and the board of trustees at most universities, Lachs warns. "A gulf exists that's very damaging to both sides. As the chair of the faculty senate, once a year I was ushered in to make a five-minute speech to the board and then ushered out," he says.

"I happen to be a great believer in informal contact. I asked the board members to lunch, and how many took me up on that? Zero. At least talk and listen to different perspectives. That isn't being done enough."

In fact, the 2010 Association of Governing Boards study found that only 23 percent of board members and faculty members alike understood each other's role "well" or "very well." Lachs suggests the need for more than mutual understanding. "What would it be like to have one or two faculty members on the Board of Trustees?" he asks. "The right faculty member on a receptive board could make a big difference."

Success at Salisbury

Believers on both sides of the shared governance model agree that it has a valuable place, and is still alive and kicking. Dudley-Eshbach believes that shared governance is vibrant on her campus, noting that her staff meets regularly with representatives of the faculty senate, staff senate, and the student government association.

Even though these bodies are advisory, she takes what they say seriously. "Effective presidents today must really be good listeners," she explains. "When you seek input, it often delays decisions, but I find the results tend to be better in the long run."

Dudley-Eshbach recalls that after co-chairing a re-accreditation committee visiting a school in New Jersey, she came away impressed that faculty there taught three four-hour courses per term instead of the four three-hour courses practiced at Salisbury. "I threw the idea out," she notes. "There was a huge debate over a year and a half—any discussion about curriculum gets pretty heated—and there was a campus-wide vote."

While Salisbury's school of liberal arts adopted the idea, the university's three other schools of science and technology, business, and education passed on the idea, Dudley-Eshbach reports.

"If I as president had shoved the idea down everyone's throat, there wouldn't have been a buy-in. From my perspective, the university management model is akin to a progressive business or company where every employee owns stock. If I empower the faculty and they have input, I'm going to be more successful."

The AAUP, meanwhile, is encouraging its members to become more actively involved in shared governance at their institutions, and those members are beginning to get the message. While the AAUP had to cancel its first Shared Governance Conference in 2009 due to lack of interest, the 2010 version sold out.

The more than 250 participants from colleges around the country heard presentations and took workshops on areas from the role of the faculty senate in budgeting and reviewing faculty and administrative collaboration in challenging times to faculty governance of intercollegiate athletics and challenges to governance from demands for accountability.

"Once upon a time, you just did your teaching and your research," says the AAUP's Nelson. "But people are becoming aware that only community action can generate the parts of shared governance critical to a university's community life."

Ron Schachter is a Boston-based freelance writer

<http://www.universitybusiness.com/article/what-ever-happened-shared-governance-0>

COPPIN STATE UNIVERSITY

CHAPTER

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

December 4, 2011

The Honorable Norman H. Conway
Chairman, House Appropriations
Committee
130 Lowe House Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

The Honorable Edward J. Kasemeyer
Chairman, Senate Budget and
Taxation Committee
3 West, Miller Senate Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dear Chairman Conway and Chairman Kasemeyer:

On September 22, 2011, Pursuant to the 2010 Maryland General Assembly (MGA) Joint Chairman's Report R30B27, Page 137; you were sent a "Report on The Implementation of Recommendations made by the 2001 Independent Study Team on The Revitalization of Coppin State College (now University). This 2011 Coppin Study Team was chaired by Dr. William B. DeLauder.

The Coppin State University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (CSU-AAUP) wishes to offer the following comments and concerns regarding the 2011 Team Report:

The Study Team was formed and completed its work without any consideration or regard for faculty perspective or faculty input. Of the team's twelve members no member of the Coppin state University Faculty sat on the team. Of the teams' eleven staff support personnel, no member of the Coppin State University faculty was involved. This was an egregious denial of involvement of the persons who are daily responsible for the implementation of the university's academic program, its primary mission.

The report reflects this gross exclusion of faculty perspective and input. It is unconscionable that a team appointed to assess university progress in implementing the recommendations of the 2001 Revitalization of Coppin State University would be devoid of faculty input and participation.

The major outcomes of any institution of higher education are very much faculty dependent. It is the faculty that provides the instruction and largest contribution to successful student outcomes. These outcomes include qualifying for degrees through developing the knowledge and skills to become productive members of the society usually at a professional level.

Given the absence of faculty involvement in the work of the team, the CSU-AAUP wishes to direct your attention and consideration to the following specific concerns and shortcomings of the 2011 Team Report:

- 1) During the Ten year implementation of the 2001 Revitalization effort, the six-year graduation rate at Coppin State University declined by approximately 50% from 26% to 13%. This is CSU's (and the University System's') lowest graduation rate in at least the last twenty years.
- 2) During this Ten year period CSU added a mere 85 faculty members but 162 staff members. This included at least seven (7) top level administrators primarily vice presidents, deans and directors. This added to an already disproportionate (relative to other USM Institutions) on administration when compared to instructional expenditures (see USM Dashboard Report _____). It is not clear that all of the 47 new faculty members are in fact primarily classroom faculty. A number of these positions are being deployed as full or part-time administrators.
- 3) Of the Colleges and Universities compared in the report, CSU continues to have the lowest percentage of fulltime faculty and the highest percentage of part-time faculty (50%). While the student faculty rate has declined from 17 to 14, the rate includes the 1/3 time allocated to adjunct faculty. Adjunct faculty are typically not available to perform the needed support and nurturing responsibilities associated with full-time faculty members.
- 4) While 85% of CSU students received financial aid, only 39% received institutional financial aid. Sixty-four percent (64%) of CSU students received Pell grants which identify them as students with the greatest need according to the federal guidelines associated with the administration of Pell grants. This suggests that at least 25% of the neediest students received no institutional support. It should be noted that a significant amount of institutional aid is received by athletes and honor students whose awards are not tied to need. As the number of Pell Grant recipients increased, the amount of institutional aid decreased. This has resulted in a disproportionate number of full time students compelled to seek employment to afford to attend CSU. The institutional need statement (in the report) does not include the growing cost of books, supplies or transportation. The vast majority of CSU full time students are commuters. The report

does not mention the use of Federal Work Study funds, nor does it indicate that any institutional funds are being used to provide student employment.

- 5) Imperative III, Enhance Student Success (page 30), does not speak to the role of faculty in student success.
- 6) Key elements in the 2001 recommendations including a child care facility for students with children have not been implemented. The built daycare facility is actually being utilized by the Baltimore City Schools Pre-Kindergarten Program.
- 7) The partial implementation of Noell-Levitz recommendations regarding financial aid staffing and the use of technology is glaring. Despite the tremendous amount of funds used to upgrade campus technology, vital processing capabilities have not been implemented in financial aid or other key office across the campus. Despite receiving the highest number of student complaints and concerns the offices of financial aid and records remain essentially what they were in 2001.
- 8) The ten year build out to support a larger student population does not include the necessary faculty and student support staff to accommodate such growth. While the report repeatedly stresses the larger need of CSU students (implied comparison to other USM Universities) for nurturing and other supportive services, no intensive discussion of related staffing patterns or faculty workloads is included. CSU continues to be among the highest teaching loads, highest student-teacher ratios in the USM.
- 9) The emphasis on the high pass rates of the Nursing and Education programs masks the actual low productivity of both programs (p.55). The relatively low graduation numbers suggest a very high per student expenditure given faculty numbers and statuses in both programs.
- 10) The report's emphasis on the receipt of capital funding at CSU is misleading. While CSU received the second highest capital funding in total dollars and the highest level of capital funding per FTE (2001-2011) those numbers should include the 20 years preceding the 2001 study during which CSU was grossly underfunded in capital dollars.

(SUMMARY STATEMENT)

(RECOMMENDATIONS)

Yours Truly,

John L. Hudgins, PHD
President, CSU-AAUP